



7

**Private Library**  
OF  
**R. D. BROWN, M. D.**  
**Homeopathic Physician**

"And please return it. You may think this a strange request, but I find that although many of my friends are poor arithmaticians, they are nearly all good book-keepers."—*Scott.*

THE ADAIR BOOK STORE  
NEW & OLD BOOKS  
BOUGHT, SOLD AND EXCHANGED.  
No. 43 E. VAN BUREN ST. CHICAGO, ILL.  
PHONE—WABESS 2444

25





LETTER

TO

J. B. HEMINWAY, M. D.,

PHYSICIAN AND SURGEON BY APPOINTMENT

OF HIS EXCELLENCY,

LUCIUS FAIRCHILD,

GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,

TO THE

*Institution for the Education of the Deaf and Dumb.*

BY

R. STODDARD GEE,

OF

DELAVAN, WIS.

---

DELAVAN, WIS.,

"REPUBLICAN" BOOK PRESS PRINT.

1870.

LETTER

J. B. HICKINWAY, M.D.

COMMISSIONER AND SHERIFF OF ALABAMA

WBK

6297L

1870

OFFICE OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

TO THE

COMMISSIONER OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

BY

J. B. HICKINWAY, M.D.

TO

DEAR SIR:

YOURS VERY TRULY,

J. B. HICKINWAY, M.D.

BY

## INTRODUCTION.

---

AN INTRODUCTION to this letter is hardly necessary, as the reader will see at a glance that it has been written to defend the principles of Homeopathy against the gross misrepresentations of the Allopathists of Delavan. Doubtless those not acquainted with the circumstances calling it forth will say it is too personal and harsh, but we cannot defend ourselves from personal attacks in any other way. The citizens of Delavan will justify our defense, and to them we submit—yes, we appeal, if in any way we have balanced the scales by using hard words or personalities. “With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again,” should be the motto of every Homeopathist, and when our system is assailed by “Old Physic” he should roll back the tide of evidence against the defunct system. Then, and not till then, will they learn to respect Homeopathists as a body, and do honor to those principles which are as much superior to those of Allopathy, as heaven is higher, more holy, and purer than hell.

Had we come here an advocate of bleeding in all its forms and degrees of severity, from the moderate half pound of Dr. Gray to the "bleeding to depletion" of Wood, the "copious bleeding" of Mendenhall "decisively practiced," or Cunningham's bleeding "till the patient faints," or the thirteen bleedings of Hardy in pneumonia, or the "*coup-sur-coup* of Bouillard"; in fact, had we bled until the crimson current was so far wasted that life had nearly fled; or had we "shaved our patients' heads, blistered them from neck to heels," flayed them alive from head to foot with Spanish flies, potato bugs, red hot irons, or scalding water; or had we mercurialized them until they became living barometers, with rotten teeth, carious bones, ulcerated throats, and pestiferous breaths; or had we purged and vomited them until they were walking skeletons in human form, or had we poured in whiskey punch, opium, quinine and brandy until it was impossible to tell whether the "dying delirium was the result of a diseased condition of the brain, or was caused by the miserable narcotics" and stimulating trash that we had given them; and finally, had we lulled our patients to an eternal sleep with opiates, and by this means lost thirty patients instead of one, we would have passed as "a splendid fellow," "well posted in practice," "a gentleman of the regular system." But because we considered it wrong to kill our patients, and acted according to the teachings of Him who hath said "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy," we have been made the victim



of a wanton and cruel persecution. From a sense of duty and self-respect we have therefore defended the right and exposed the wrong.

Should any member of the Homeopathic profession think our style too severe, we only ask them to exchange locations of practice with us for one month, and try to do a business by the side of men who say "No Homeopathist shall be allowed to remain here in peace;" "We'll make it so hot for the d—d quacks that they'll have to mosey"; "We'll shove him out if it costs a thousand dollars;" and in every way but a fair and honorable one, labor to carry those designs into execution, then we think a hearty sanction will be given to the course we have adopted in defending the intruded rights of Homeopathy.

Others may condemn us for a want of candor towards our rival opponents. To this we reply, that whilst they show a deficiency in common honesty, and persist in misrepresenting the claims of Homeopathy, by ridicule, contempt, and false imputations, in the room of reason and argument, they must expect a return of like compliments. We have, therefore, treated the subject with all the candor we think it deserves. When arguments worthy of candid and mature reflection are presented by our opponents in a respectful and inquiring manner worthy the great principles which involve the consideration of the science of medicine, we pledge ourselves to return a like consideration of thought for the intelligent reader.

Should this fall into the hands of any member of the profession, he must bear in mind that we are not writing to enlighten him, but to defend the rights of Homeopathy for those not conversant with her principles, and to expose to view the dogmas of the Allopathic practice among those most devoted to its teachings. Therefore we have made free quotations from the writings of Drs. Marcy, Hunt, Dudgeon, Cockburn, Henderson and Hempel, making no other apology for so doing than the good of the cause.

To those who may feel disposed to criticise our humble effort to promote the great interests of mankind by disseminating the doctrine of Homeopathy, we say, "Go thou and do better;" the people are ready for instruction.

Believing that we are right, we have fearlessly spoken, in the hope that some of our readers may have their eyes open to facts just as they actually exist, and be saved from a death of slow torture by the murderous principles of Allopathy.

THE AUTHOR.

DELAWARE, May 1, 1870.







## THE TWO SYSTEMS COMPARED.

---

*My Dear Sir :—*

It is not owing to your many assaults upon the merits of Hhomeopathy, or the irritability of their nature, that has prompted us to address you, but the love of truth, and justice to the public.

We also wish to set the people right, not only upon the principles of Hhomeopathy, which you are ridiculing and grossly misrepresenting, but also to hold up the merits of the two systems of practice, so that the people among whom we are laboring may be able to judge for themselves in relation to the merits of Hhomeopathy by the side of Allopathy. That there should be many views and theories in the practice of medicine as well as in politics and religion, is no wonder. But that the love of party, creed, or principles, should lead man to basely falsify the views of others, is surprising. For it is an admitted maxim, that just in proportion as any party falsifies or misrepresents the principles and teachings of his opponents, in the same proportion he weakens his own, when those misrepresentations

are proven false. Therefore, not as a matter of choice, but from a sense of duty, we must expose the false statements made upon the merits of our system of practice. In doing this, we shall say many things against Allopathy that are hard, and, in the light of humanity, seemingly untrue. We stand shocked at what are called acts of mercy by Allopathists. But sir, we invite you to point out any thing that may be found in this letter that in any way pertains to the merits of the two systems that we do not fairly represent. If you do not, you must stand convicted of all the charges we shall make against Allopathy. If you do, your cause will be honorable, and as such, we welcome you as a gentlemanly opponent. We admit, there are many principles, the advocates of which are ever at variance with each other, among which may be mentioned good and evil, forbearance and revenge, heaven and hell, God and the devil, Homeopathy and Allopathy. In proportion to their similarity or dissimilarity will they approximate to, or recede from each other. This law appears to hold good in the principles of church, creeds, politics, and the theory and practice of medicine.

Between no two contending parties for theories, principles, or doctrines, is there a wider range of opinion than exists between the rival schools of Homeopathy and Allopathy; each aiming to accomplish the same thing, yet holding views directly at variance with each other. What is truth to one, is heterodoxical to the other. Homeopathy, with her minute doses, comes teaching cleanliness, mercy, and humanity, through her scientific law of medication, viz : *Similia Similibus Curantur*. Whereas Allopathy calls this "humbuggery," and comes to the patient, already writhing in agony, or dying with pain, and with massive doses of compounds and life-destroying implements, declares the only law

of cure to be that of *Contraria Contrariis Curantur*, obtained through the use of cathartics, emetics, blisters, clysters, setons, cupping-glass and lancet. Each party in turn, becomes hammer and anvil upon which blows are freely given and received. Therefore, when you give blows, you must in return receive them. When you occupy the position of leader in the world, attempting to force your views upon the people, you occupy the position of a hammer, and in return must assume the office of an anvil. He whom you assail and the principles which you oppose, will in return become the assailant, and defender of his intruded rights, and use you as an anvil upon which he will "straighten the crooked nails," "refasten the rivets of their broken system," "smooth the wrinkles out of their battered faces," "or punish it with spiteful indentations." "The perfection of art with such a man is, to strike heartily when he assumes the office of a hammer, and bear bravely when in return he is compelled to be an anvil."

This abridged quotation from the pen of Timothy Titcomb illustrates very forcibly the positions we occupy towards each other. From the day of our first arrival here, as a Homeopathic physician we became the anvil upon which you and others dealt light and heavy blows, not only against us; but the principles upon which we predicate our practice. The blows you aimed at us so rapidly and roughly doubtless were to gain, or rather retain that power, influence, position and reputation you held in this community as an allopathist. How far we have borne these knocks, and the way we have returned them, the public are at liberty to judge. In one thing you doubtless mistook your calculation, viz: that you supposed yourself capable of inflicting upon us and our practice such sledge hammer blows that we would be crushed under their weight, or, if we survived, leave us so crippled

that in return you would receive only the light blows of our tack hammer. We have, however, been able to bear them without flinching, and, in one or two instances, we have used you, and others who have assailed us, as the anvils upon which we have demonstrated, in a fearless and conscientious manner, our views of the systems we are practicing. But, sir, these blows have been fairly, openly, and honorably given. In secret, in the dark, or behind your back, we have said nothing. Our lectures in defense of Homeopathy, and our *expose* of Allopathy, have been frankly and publicly given. Our pamphlets have been freely distributed. But in return, have you acted thus honorably? Have your attacks upon Homeopathy been in our presence, or where we could in any way defend the right of Homeopathy; or expose the wrong of Allopathy? Have you not on all occasions dealt blows when, and where, we could not defend ourself against them? and in so doing, have you not, either ignorantly or designedly, misrepresented every principle, part, and parcel, of the teachings of Homeopathy? It was these ungentlemanly attacks upon us that caused the publication of an old lecture, somewhat modified to meet the conditions for which it was designed. A continuation of this course prompts the issue of this letter, when we again assume the office of hammer, while you and others must in return be the anvil upon which we propose to test the merits of the two systems of practice.

Before we proceed to an investigation of those principles which involve the merits of the two schools, it will be necessary to classify our opponents. This step is rendered imperative from the fact that in proportion to the position they occupy as gentlemen, and scholars of real worth and professional attainments, will be the weight of their influence and



testimony in relation to the merits or demerits of H<sup>o</sup>meopathy and Allopathy.

Every person who watches the development of circumstances which surround the profession of medicine, will readily divide our opponents into five general classes. Four of these are the very opposite of the fifth. The first constitutes the minority of the profession so far as numbers are concerned. But as the head serves to give impression to all other members of the body, and is the great directing power, so this class gives life, power and existence to the other four. It is the head and front, without which the others would soon become a scoff and a byword, "a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." The learned Dr. Johnson (allopathist) is reported to have said that "the majority of the profession were the puppies which did the barking, and reminding him forcibly of a dog with a tin pan tied to his tail, and let loose in the community, yelping at every jump, and serving as amusement to those looking on."

### THE FIRST CLASS.

The men composing this class are those of real merit, who have studied long and hard for professional distinction, and have made themselves masters of the science they profess. Such men are ever aiming to achieve high intellectual attainments, are devoted students, reason and think for themselves. Their libraries are large, well selected, and devotedly studied. Being guided by an innate love for scientific and philosophical researches, they carefully scrutinize and examine the claims of the system they practice. Of this class there are a goodly number in their ranks. From this class the H<sup>o</sup>meopathic ranks are rapidly being filled, and from them we shall introduce testimony to show your

own practice in its true light, and the opinions they entertain of Allopathy as presented to an afflicted public.

### THE SECOND CLASS

Are the roughs—those practitioners who possess but little or no feelings, refinement or principles; prefer anything to hard study and scientific attainments; can play bluff on all other members of the profession; put on very important airs, and a bully kind of a swagger; argue by profane oaths; are skeptics in religion; and prefer surgery to any part of the profession, for one or two reasons:

First, it requires but little hard study or close thinking, and still less responsibility in the practice of medicine. Second, they have the same views about operative surgery that the boys have about smoking. The latter think they are nearly equal to the magistrate, the lawyer, or the judge, if they can get behind a pipe or cigar, puff the filthy perfume with manly dignity, and touch the ashes off the lighted end with the tip of the little finger, and the former thinks he is the big doctor if he can use the *tenaculum* and *scalpel*, and with a draw up of his sleeves, give the knife a peculiar professional flourish, and with an oath, boast how he loves its use, and, as we once saw one of this kind, wash his hands in the blood of an unfortunate patient, and with an inhuman grin, boastfully say “he loved blood.” Thirdly, he knows the masses are incapable to judge of real merit or professional skill by intellectual perception, but can pass a kind of judgment on operative surgery from ocular demonstration. This class generally bury their profession in horse fairs and poor whiskey, and when they practice medicine are supported by the roughs of society. Such men can damn Homeopathy to the tune of Yankee Doodle and never miss a note.

## THE THIRD CLASS

Follow their profession because they have learned it. Their highest aims were to procure a diploma; this obtained, they take no further pains to ascertain whether their practice is based on truth or error, love ease and pleasure, are never seen with a book, periodical or manuscript, are quite indifferent as far as their minds are concerned whether the patient lives or dies, though self interest prompts them to manifest apparently an unusual interest in their welfare; have no libraries, take no journals, and are just where they were the day they received their doctorate. There are a plenty of this class.

## THE FOURTH CLASS

Comprises those who are intent upon making money; whose highest aim is to have a good practice. They are very social and clever, attend the most popular church to gain its influence, know a little about all schools in the practice of medicine, but are not thoroughly posted in either, can be an Allopathist, Eclectic, or Homeopathist, as best suits the particular views of the patient they are prescribing for. He can explain, denounce, or approve any school just in proportion to his personal interest, has no principle about the matter, a regular weather-cock, turns any way, but comes home to roost, crows the longest and loudest for his original views, if he had any, viz: Allopathy.

But what shall we say of

## THE FIFTH CLASS

Of our professional opponents? Are they Allopathists? We can scarcely consider them as such, or the legitimate representatives of any school in the practice of medicine. They should be classed with mongrels, being neither one thing or the other. They pretend, however, to be the disciples of *Æs-*

culapius, and advocate the principles of Allopathy ; therefore are our bitter opponents. This *imported gentleman* claims to have been very noted at home, exhibiting old brass buttons with a peculiar figure, claiming this as his coat of arms, and was of the most distinguished family of royalty, four thousand miles away.

But, really, it is bringing the practice of medicine in all schools below par to recognize them in the ranks of the profession. Nevertheless as they are among the most vindictive enemies of Homeopathy, we must return the compliment by an exchange of views in relation to their practice. We acknowledge, however, that our information has come to us second handed ; for, in justice, we must say we have never read any works that in any way sanctioned this *sauer kraut system*. It certainly is not to be found in the works of ancient or modern Allopathy. In the dark days of ignorance and superstition, amulets were sold and worn as a preventive to disease. Others invoked the spirits of the thirty-six demons of the air, believing that they held power over disease, and divided the bodies of the dead among them, each claiming a particular part for his prey. We have also read of the Isopathic theory, in which the leaders taught that every order of disease was cured by roasting and eating the same organ in those animals most resembling man. Thus Dioscorides, Xenocrates, Galen, Serapio, Paulus and Ægirreta recommend the lungs of the fox, roasted and pulverized, for the cure of asthma ; also the roasted liver of a mad dog, for hydrophobia. Galen recommends the brains of camels for epilepsy, Haley, Abbas and Celsus, dead scorpions to cure its sting. We have also read of the Humeral doctrine, Analytical practice, Eclectic, Hydro-  
pathy, Homeopathy, Allopathy, Steamopathy, &c., but never, until we reached Delavan, Wisconsin, did we hear that any



such school existed as that instituted by this distinguished practitioner. We shall anxiously look for some works, the products of this noted scholar of *Brass Button Royalty* and learn for ourselves what are the peculiarities of this system. We understand, however, that one of the qualifications requisite for graduation is amputation of the index finger. The followers of this school doubtless will be few, for we seldom see a man so lost in sensuality as to submit to the amputation of the fore finger for the purpose of practicing in this way.

Such practice reminds us more of a house of assignation, where the inmates and the scape grace are roomed in secret guilt together. In fact, it seems that no man of a pure mind or christian character could ever have instituted such a practice. It seems more like the out-birth of low sensualism, where the chasm of modesty, purity and virtue is passed at a leap, than the exalted dignity of a professional gentleman. We are informed that his practice is exclusive, and that husbands are excluded from the precincts of their own sanctuaries during the period of his professional visits. Why is this if it is honorable? Do other physicians closet themselves in private seclusion with their patients? No, verily,—husbands and mothers are invited to remain in the room. The lips of most of his patients are sealed with eternal silence, and well for him that they are. She seldom tells of his treatment, and his wrong acts, as she supposes herself of necessity the victim of his infamous practice. We cannot estimate the depth of wrongs that can be perpetrated by such a practitioner. The mind cannot fathom the gulf of infamy that is associated with the immorality of such a man. His professional garb gives him a passport to the confidence of the people, only to betray that confidence by the basest acts of a practitioner, unlike anything ever read of or taught in a medical college. We have no

necessity to point to the morals of Paris, New York or Washington, or visit the precincts of those haunts of vice, drinking saloons or dance houses, to see plans laid to decoy the innocent and pure in heart from the paths of virtue. In Delavan, beneath the shadow of the cross, in our own vicinity, we find persons beyond the blush of modesty, instituting the most disgusting theory for the cure of the ills of life, that it has ever been our lot to learn or read about—a practice peculiar to his own low estimate of cleanliness, morality, virtue, purity and respectability.

But, as we propose to publish a pamphlet upon this subject at our earliest convenience, we shall omit further remarks here. Suffice it to say, the whole thing will be duly exposed, at a proper time. We had to refer to it in this connection, as the leader is particularly opposed to Homeopathy, and endeavoring to crush with you its rapid progress, and bury us in oblivion. Consequently, we propose that the public shall know how grossly it has been imposed upon, and just the treatment the wives and daughters of the community have submitted to at the hands of this distinguished practitioner.

Having thus classified our professional opponents, we shall leave it for you to place yourself in which class you please; the public will do the same. But in addressing you we shall consider you as ranking in the first, trusting that your ability will justify us in thus ranking you with those of real worth and merit, for it certainly would be no credit to defend ourselves against the assaults of the other classes, or the principles of Homeopathy from their misrepresentations other than for the public good. It appears you have taken personal exceptions to some remarks in the pamphlet we recently published upon the principles of Homeopathy vs. Allopathy, but offer as an excuse for not replying, first, that it is not addressed to you;

second, that it is rough and unprofessional : consequently, you, or any other Allopathist of note or distinction, cannot degrade the exalted position you occupy, enough to reply. We shall remove the first objection by addressing this letter to you. In reply to the second objection, we think the pamphlet is clothed in fully as good a professional garment as the constant cry of "quack," "humbug," &c., which falls from your lips at every corner of the street, not only about us, but all Homeopathic physicians.

Without doubt you feel more keenly the remarks of that pamphlet than any other physician in this city, as they were intentionally prepared for you, to show up your inconsistent assaults upon us as a Homeopathist, when at the same time you were filching many of her principal remedies, and yet claiming to be strictly a disciple of Æsculapius. Therefore we designed it to be pointed. It goes before the world to show up, in an unvarnished manner, a rough, harsh, wicked, inhuman and barbarous practice, having its origin in the darkest days of heathenism and superstition. To deal with a man who upholds ideas promulgated to the world in the dark days of rude and uncultivated barbarism, in a smooth and oily manner, would only be casting pearls at the feet of a rival practitioner, whose only argument against Homeopathy is the cry of "quack," "humbug," "dupe," "impostor" "a fool or a knave," "sugar pill," or "poka moonshine doctor," who "ought to be exterminated, root and branch." These with a host of similar expressions, you are daily pressing upon the people against us, and the principles upon which we are practicing, called for the publication of that pamphlet, as well as this letter. We had supposed that, with your master genius and astute intellect, you would attack us on some points which we designedly left open, and can hardly conceive it

possible that one who claims to be the champion of Allopathy, can let his giant intellect slumber when his ancient citadel is assailed by a poor lone, "ignorant" Hhomeopathist, unless you consider the charges just, and that a further effort to sustain a worthless and exploded system useless, and that bravado and abusive language are the only arguments upon which you can depend to sustain your rapidly declining principles.

Doubtless you are not alone in the odious and abusive epithets used in denouncing us and the Hhomeopathic system. Others may assail us with the same "fire in the rear." But the cries of "quack," "humbug," "fool," impostor," &c., are no arguments, and will be replied to only with the merit they deserve. In justice to them we must say we have heard of no assault. However, if others have united with you, either publicly or privately, in denouncing our practice and the principles of Hhomeopathy, they are at liberty to wear the coat we have prepared for you. Or, if you prefer, you may cast lots for the garment, to see which shall wear it, or answer through the press the arguments and accusations presented against your system, and those in favor of Hhomeopathy. We also assure you that until the principles which guide us in the selection and administration of our remedies shall be duly respected by members of the Allopathic profession where we labor, and until the courtesies of the profession are extended to Hhomeopathic practitioners, we shall use the spear and battle ax with all the powers of our limited resources. When this shall be done, we will gladly lay off the armor of warfare, and unite on common grounds of humanity in our efforts to promote the interests of mankind by healing the sick, alleviating their sufferings, and cooling the fevered brow. You must remember, however, that Hhomeopathists will never go down, or acknowledge inferiority, to gain an honorable po-

sition in your ranks, or escape the odium of being called a "quack," a "humbug," a "small pill doctor!" Must the reformer descend into the cesspool of iniquity, wallow in the gutter with the inebriate, or shake hands on a common equality with the inmates of the brothel, in order to reform and elevate them to the pure walks in life, and high position in society? We think not. The philanthropist and reformer extends to such outcasts an eye of pity—a hand of relief. He will gladly elevate their position, and lead them into a purer and better life. This is precisely the position that H<sup>o</sup>meopathy occupies with Allopathy. She is the reformer, and as such has shown by her practices the world over, a superiority; consequently she will never descend into the cesspool of Allopathic practices, wallow amidst cathartics, emetics, setons, lancets, cupping-glasses, blisters, cataplasms of "swallow's nest," boiled oils, cat's brain, cow's manure, and corn meal, to gain what you call an honorable position among the bigoted, self-conceited Allopathists. When you shall lay these things aside, as remedial agents on the law of *contrariis*, come up to the pure and wholesome principles of H<sup>o</sup>meopathy, and acknowledge, *not us*, but that the teachings of H<sup>o</sup>meopathy in every way are not only equal to, but *superior* to Allopathy, we will be content, but never till then. To those of your school who are willing to meet us, and other members of the H<sup>o</sup>meopathic profession, upon equal grounds, equal merits, and equal position, we extend the same cordial greeting, and deeply regret that, like poor Tray, they have to be whipped for being found in bad company. Or, in other words, we regret that your ungentlemanly assaults upon our practice and the merits of H<sup>o</sup>meopathy, has forced us to retort upon the teachings and practices of Allopathy, by which means we assail those principles which are entertained by many of our



personal friends, for whom we hold the highest esteem, not only as citizens, but as professional gentlemen.

But, sir, as rough and ungentlemanly as you may consider the pamphlet at which you have taken such exceptions, and as harshly as we have assailed the practice and teachings of Allopathy, in no one place have we lowered our professional dignity enough to call you a "quack," "humbug," "impostor," a "deceiver," a "knave," or said that you "ought to be exterminated root and branch," "rode on a rail, or tarred and feathered."

Without doubt you think from the antiquity of your school, you can issue bulls of extermination and slang phrases against Homeopathy, as a right. Professor Allen, of Rush Medical College, Chicago, had the same idea when, in a public lecture before the graduating class, he called them "Street Scavengers," &c., &c. Such men as you and he would "row us up Salt Creek," stop the influence of the press, and the right of the people to choose what kind of practice they shall have and who shall serve themselves and families. We do not attempt to force our views upon you or the people. Those who prefer Allopathy to Homeopathy have a right to choose it, and those who like the practice of the imported gentleman of brass button royalty have a perfect right to choose it, provided they can lower themselves in the estimation of their own sex, enough to submit to the *highly respectable* and scientific system, peculiar to those only of sensual rinds and habits—a practice without precedent in the history of medicine, either ancient or modern, even back to the days of Æsculapius up to the noonday of the nineteenth century, a system which eclipses all quackery yet extant, and the lowest acts of the "lowdest" dance houses. We can only add, God help the lady who submits to a practice which allows the physician to

pass the bounds of propriety, much less modesty and respectability, draws the veil that adorns her virtue, by placing herself in the power of an arch demon, who, under the garb of a professional gentleman, and the potent influences of certain remedies which, doubtless, he knows *too* well how to use, and in private seclusion, closeted in retirement and under circumstances which, if a man felt disposed, could lower her upon a level with the adulteress.

We do not say this is the case. We are only speaking of the propriety of ladies placing themselves under the influence of any physician, and under circumstances like those referred to. Let me ask any enlightened, pure minded woman, if she feels safe under such circumstances; and the husband, if he can see his wife submit to a practice that is not recommended, taught, or sanctioned by any medical author or professors of colleges in the United Kingdoms of earth.

We protest, in the name of moral decency, and christianity, against the conduct of any professional man whose acts set at naught the sacred ties of the marriage relation, trample upon the pure teachings of the laws of God, the laws of state, the rights of the husband, the moral and social security of the people. How such practitioners and patients can meet face to face in society, among the polite, refined, pure in heart, the christian, is beyond the power of our mind to fathom. How either can answer to the bar of public opinion can be conceived only by the brains of those who bid defiance to religion, morality and the rules of etiquette and professional decorum. The popular sentiment that can uphold such acts is rotten to the core. The lowest thoughts of iniquity have to be sounded before we can reach a point in the mind of man, where such conspiracies are laid against the rights of the marriage ritual. It is a crime against the fair sex, against the hus-

band, against morality, against society, and high heaven, equaled only by those who enter the list of free love, and seek to overthrow the words of Him who said, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Draw the veil aside, enter the secret closet where the practice is being exhibited, and methinks a sight would be presented too revolting for contemplation. It will do for the wives of hen-pecked husbands, widows, and maidens who have abandoned all thoughts of respectable marriage.

We do not say that any Allopathist in this community introduces any such practices. If there are none, then the above remarks are out of character, and should not have been introduced. If there are any, it is high time that wives and husbands knew that such a system is not sanctioned by the usages of the profession, and is a base imposition upon the credulity of the people, obtained under the garb of a 'medical man.' Yet we do not object to any person who *likes this practice better* than Homeopathy, having it. Neither do we protest against any employing you, or any other system which they think seems right. But we would have the whole fraternity understand that whilst they are hurling their thunderbolts at Homeopaths, and falsifying everything in relation to her principles, that we in turn will roll back the tide of evidence and expose to the gaze of the world the relative merits of our systems. This course will enable the people to sift the wheat from the chaff, reject the filthy, the unclean, the impure, the health destroying; the killing power of medicine, for the pure, cleanly, desirable practice and the curative power of remedies.

During two thousand years the people have heard the cry, "Great is the goddess Allopathy!" Do you wish them to hear it longer?" Or are you afraid your "craft is in danger," be-

cause the Homeopaths are "turning the world upside down," and, as a means of saving yourselves, resort to abusing us? For smoldering centuries it has been the studied effort of Allopathists to crush every opposing interest, to overthrow, by persecution, legislative power, and even death, those who dared assert a principle different from their own and maintain it for truth's sake. Is not this the spirit manifested towards us by Allopathists here?

But we ask, have you a right to assail a newly promulgated theory or doctrine by persecution, slang or abuse, until you have first overthrown it by argument? It is universally admitted that just in proportion to the weakness of an opponent's principles will be their vindictive assaults upon those who advocate principles adverse to their own. For where theories or doctrines can be overthrown by arguments, they will always be resorted to in the room of persecution or abusive language. If a newly promulgated principle or doctrine cannot be destroyed by such means, it is conceding the point to introduce the sword of persecution; and rest assured that when argument fails, persecution and abuse prevail, it is convincing evidence that the new theory is based on truth, and as such will stand the storm of contending foes, commanding the respect of good, truth-loving and scientific minds, unless they should be biased by self-love, preconceived and secular motives, as is the case with a large majority of Allopathists who are so rigidly opposed to the teachings of our school. Ridicule, persecution and malicious epithets are no arguments, and should be resorted to only after a theory has been fairly examined and its errors publicly exposed. Have you, or any other Allopathist, taken this course with us? Has any member of your school ever presented a single argument against Homeopathy that for one moment stood the criticism of our

authors? If so, bring them forward, give them to us and the public for general good.

But on the other hand have not the principles taught by our school shaken the stronghold of Allopathy to its very foundation? Are you not forced in your practice to forsake nearly every principle once promulgated by your school? The lancet, once so popular in inflammatory diseases, is now forsaken and condemned; mercurial salivation is now looked upon as the bane of man's existence; emetics are sparingly used as curative agents. Nevertheless, in your medical works they are freely recommended. Thus step by step, has Homeopathy dismembered Allopathy of its strongest weapons for evil, and gradually has been using less and less medicine, and depleting measures. Has not Homeopathy shown to the world that venesection favors and hastens hepaticization, and the oftener it is repeated the more sure the poor unfortunate victim is to have this condition of the lungs in cases of pneumonia? Has she not also proven that venesection in cases of pleuritis only produces metastasis, calling for a second, third or fourth bleeding? Has not Homeopathy nearly swept from earth the advocates of mercurial salivation? Has she not forced from public gaze the old fashioned saddle-bags, with the advocates of those massive doses of our boyhood days? Why then don't you correct your letters, as well as your practice? We answer, because in practice you can act the part of deception; yet, for the love of old preconceived theories, your medical works still abound with abominations.

It seems the spirit of persecution manifested by Allopathists has no bounds when any discoveries are made, which do not coincide with the peculiar views held and taught by them, and from this circumstance alone we may un-



derstand why the science of medicine has made so little progress during two thousand years, when compared with other discoveries. We refer more particularly to the theory of practice, but not to anatomy, physiology, chemistry, botany, &c., for these are auxiliary branches upon which the science of medicine is dependent, and are open to all schools, to be used either for evil or good by those on the one hand who prefer to combat disease with gross ponderable agents, empirically chosen and recklessly given, or, on the other hand, by those who endeavor to appreciate the delicate structure of the human organism, the phenomena manifested by imponderable agents, as presented in disease, and the dependence manifested through imponderable agents in the form of remedies, and their relationship to disease.

Whilst the reform school, through the Homeopathic telescope, can view all these phenomena, and the beauty of our law of cure, and the relationship existing between disease and remedies, the Allopathists of to-day are treading in the footsteps of Hyppocrates, Galen, Æsculapius, preferring to follow their teaching, administering remedies in the same way as did those heathen Allopathists twenty-two hundred years ago, when alchemy, sorcery and astrology held the rank now attained by chemistry, anatomy and physiology, and spend more time in pressing as it were to the very door of death the Homeopathist, than investigating those principles which are destined to revolutionize the practice of medicine. Truth, however, can never be destroyed. It has been crushed to earth, but like Phœnix in the fable, it rises to new life from the smoldering ashes of its slain advocate. This is what is taught by the past history of medicine, for Allopathists have labored as hard to overthrow other discoveries, now universally revered, as they now do the rising glory of Homeop-

athy. But did they succeed? Nay, verily. The right to investigate is not only a privilege, but a duty we owe to ourselves, to God and humanity. Hence, when you as an Allopathist endeavor to suppress this right because it conflicts with your pecuniary interest, or bids fair to overthrow preconceived dogmas, by exposing the pernicious teachings of your system, you assume a position that past history teaches us will not be tolerated, especially by the growing intelligence of the American people.

Strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true that your school lays claim to every discovery of the past that in any way tends to promote its interests, or cover the crimes that follow its practices, although the discovery has come into popular use through the fiery furnace of Allopathic persecution. As an example of this, we refer you to Jenner, the discoverer of vaccination, who came near losing his life after publishing to the world the results of his investigations. The throne of England was besieged, to pass the royal decree against this great philanthropist, the edict went forth, forbidding the loyal subjects of the crown from vaccinating themselves or children. Petitions circulated by the profession were presented to Parliament, praying for the banishment of this "inhuman monster," and members of Old Physic were found who testified that "vaccination was no more or less than a principle which metamorphosed the human to the brute species; one swearing "he had seen the nose, mouth and lips of children assume the form, shape and looks of calves'," another, "that small horns had appeared upon the heads of children vaccinated that resembled those of young cattle, and still another, "that many of the children became hairy all over, and that in a few instances tufts of tails had made their appearance from the end of the spinal column." This is

nothing however, for Allopathists to tell—absurdities worse than these are published by that school now of the Homeopathic system.

But we ask, did the principles promulgated to the world by Jenner die out by the acts of Parliament, by his banishment, or by the false statements made by your school? No indeed! He outlived them all, and will be held in grateful remembrance by countless millions, whilst the dust of his enemies will not be considered, in the economy of God's laws, suitable for skunk cabbage. It will be the same with the enemies of Homeopathy. Jenner lived long enough to see all acts of Parliament passed against him expunged, was reinstated to all the honors of the profession, and rewarded with \$300,000 as a compensation for his great discovery. The very remedies of which you boast the most had to be baptized with all the malice a motley crew could devise, but when popular favor demanded their general use, Old Physic has garbled them up and placed them in his *Materia Medica* as the discoveries of his school. Even quinine was condemned, and the physician of Oliver Cromwell allowed him to die of ague, rather than use the "quack remedy;" but now, only for its expense, you would use it for Allopathic soup.

John Calvin, the great reformer, caused the arrest of Michael Servetus as he was passing through Geneva, and in 1553 he was burned to death, for maintaining that the blood circulated through the lungs. This could not have been the case had not the testimony of the profession been used against him. Thus what is now universally conceded as truth was once vigorously persecuted by the very school that now claims the honor of its discovery. So strong were the prejudices of the people against this unfortunate man, that the book he wrote was used to kindle the flame that consumed

his flesh. But the truth thus supposed crushed only rested with the ashes of its discoverer until 1628, when another writer fearlessly demonstrated the principles of the circulation taught 75 years before. Harvey was at last crowned with immortal honor for perfecting what poor Michael Servetus lost his life for. All honor to whom honor is due.

It is but little over half a century since Hahnemann adopted his favorite formula, and finished, or rather perfected the discovery of a law that had been foreshadowed all along through the past ages of Allopathic history—the law of “like to cure its like,” and we predict that the rapid wings of time will not carry fifty years more with the history of the past, before Allopathy will claim the benefits of this great man’s labor, and seek to cover the crimes of her past history by the glory of this master mind. In fact, we can speak authoritatively on this subject, for Prof. Palmer in his lecture upon the merits of Homeopathy before the students of the University of Michigan said: “Long before Stahl, three general methods of cure had received recognition, the Antipathic, Allopathic and Homeopathic.” This is true in relation to the two former, but not of the latter. Hahnemann and other Homeopathic authors, have shown that the accidental cures produced by Old Physic are traceable to the one general law of “like to cure like.” He, as well as Prof. Dudgeon, of Edinburgh, has shown that a faint view of this principle was plainly traceable through the dark ages, and writings of medical history, and because Prof. Palmer finds this acknowledgment in Hahnemann’s *Organon*, he now attempts to garble the glory of this great discovery from the man his own school persecuted like blood-hounds from city to city, finding no rest from the malignant spirit ever marking his way until he found it in the bosom of death, “where the wicked

cease from troubling and the weary are at rest." That this law of cure has ever existed we grant, but that it was ever fully discovered before the days of Hahnemann, we deny. Let the great reform sweep on for a few years more, and Old Physic will claim all the glory of its discovery because Hahnemann was one of his disciples! Truly our puss has a long tail!

This same principle of intolerance and garbling remedies from our school is still manifested by the great masses of old school doctors. In proof of this we have only to refer the reader to the course pursued by the "regulars" of this, and any other town in the Union, where the philanthropist is carrying the principles of Homeopathy. Would you stop the great progressive movement in the science of medicine? Would you bury in oblivion those who are laboring for the good of the world? Are you infallible in your practice? Have you become Vicegerent with the Pope, that you can issue bulls of extermination against Homeopathy, as a right? Or do you really think that the practice of medicine cannot be reformed, because *gentlemen, men of arithmetic, and scientific scholars like yourself*, cry "humbug," "quackery," "imposture," etc., about those who deem it a duty to step aside from the teachings of Allopathy, and as an act of humanity expose what they think to be wrong?

For the benefit of your patients we will make a few quotations from some of your leading authors,—blazing meteors who have shone with as much lustre during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as does J. B. HEMINWAY, M. D., of Delavan, Wis., at the present day, and whose opinions and prescriptions were swallowed as eagerly, as the ignorant masses do cathartics, emetics, diaphoretics and expectorants from gentlemen and scientific scholars of Allo-



athy. Read these carefully, and then tell us whether a reform in the practice of medicine was not necessary. Near the close of the sixteenth century an English author writes thus :

“ANGINA,

Is a Latin word ; in English it is named Quinsy, the which is an imposthum in the throat, the which doth not let a man to swallow either meat or drink.

“THE CAUSE OF THIS INFIRMITY.

“This infirmity doth come of reume ascending from the head to the throat; and it may come of vaporous humours, descending from the stomach to the throat.

“A REMEDIE.

“Three things are requisite to help these infirmities: The first is letting of blood in a vayne named Cephalica; the second to purge the head with the pilles of Cochee; and the third is to use gargarices, and to take a little piece of pork or bacon, or else a little piece of a sponge, enoint it in oyle olive, and tie about any of these things a strong string thread, and let the patient swallow in this matter and by and by pull it out again, and be sure of the thread, that he that shall do this feate in holding faste the thread does pull it out again quickly.”

So much for the treatment of Quinsy by this scientific Allopathist in the sixteenth century. The present course of treatment laid down by Allopathic authors for this disease is, “A vigorous antiphlogistic treatment by general and local blood-letting, scarifying of the tonsils, purgatives and antiphlogistic diaphoretics.” The plain English of this antiphlogistic treatment means “to weaken the system by diminishing the activity of the vital powers.” For external applications the first author recommends “1 swallow’s nest, album greacum 3 oz., root of althea and white of lilies of each 1

oz., of figs and dates each 3. Boil them in water, then add oyle of violets, 3 drachms, chamomile flowers, meal of Fenugreek-seed, linseed, and wheat, of each 6 drachms, cat's brains 4 drachms, powders of an old owl burnt, and of burnt swallows, each two drachms, yolk of 1 egg, saffron 1 scruple; of this make a cataplasim. This cures desperate Quinsy." Modern Allopathy rejects this recipe for a poultice, and to our personal knowledge have recommended and used the fresh excrements of cows, mixed with an equal part of corn meal. The same author recommends "laudanum in drachm doses, and powdered wolf's guts in wine." The Surgeon Royal to the King of France in 1714 recommended for cancers "a decoction of vipers, crab's eyes, adders and toads, inwardly, and the powders of moles, toads, frogs and crabs calcined, with which cleanse the ulcer."

Suppose, sir, we call your attention to some remarks of the master mind of Sydenham, who in all candor has done much to elevate the science of medicine. Near the close of the sixteenth century, in speaking of *jaundice*, he says "it is caused by the diminution, loss, or decay of the animal salts in man's blood." He prescribes the following valuable Allopathic remedies: "Volatile salts of earth worms, hog's lice, serpents and toads, skins of hen's gizzards, and of their feet, skin of geese's feet, of each a drachm; volatile salts of urine, of earth worms, and of millepedes, of each a scruple, saffron in powders 15 grains. Mix them for four doses, to be given in extract of juniper berries every morning fasting;" also "the ashes of sparrow's feathers," "brains of partridges," "lice," "hog's lice," "gall of hogs," and "viper's flesh," are recommended by Helmot. Paracelsus extols "the juice extracted from the excrements of animals mixed with white wine, and given as a drink." Dr. Willes highly recommends

"lice to be given alive, nine at a time, because they are full of the *volatile animal salts*." Dr. Silvius highly commends "the volatile spirits of urine as a specific for jaundice," and we personally knew two old school doctors who strongly recommended persons having jaundice to drink a tea-cup full of their own urine, warm, nine evenings on retiring, remarking that the remedy *never failed* to produce a cure. They, however, belong to the fifth class of imported gentlemen. The authors above quoted made also free use of cathartics and emetics for this disease. The following prescription is extolled for palsy: "Mercurial purgatives," "powder of viper's flesh," "viper's bones," "volatile salts of earth worms," "man's hair," and "dried human flesh." This was as late as 1714. The following powders are given for bleeding at the nose and hemorrhage of different kinds. "Take a powder of man's blood and man's liver, dried, of each  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.; powder of dried earth worms and of catechee, of each  $\frac{1}{2}$  oz.; ashes of an old hat so roasted that it may be rubbed to powder, hog's excrements dried and powdered, of each 1 drachm; mix and divide into five powders for use." "Wood lice, man's skull filed, elk's hoof, powders of man's heart and lungs, burnt moles, sheep dung, wolf's guts, pulverized human bones," with a host of other trash, not forgetting sheep ticks and bed bugs, have been used and highly extolled by the Allopathic profession, of which you profess to be a most distinguished scientific and honorable disciple. Our heart sickens at the thought, and we turn in disgust from making further quotations. Those who wish to know more of the absurdities of that system are referred to an exposition of Allopathy by Drs. Marcy, Henderson and Helmuth, who were once able advocates of the empyrical school, but now are numbered among the principal defenders of Homeopathy. Doubtless

in your estimation these men have suddenly become metamorphosed, from gentlemen and scientific scholars of Allopathy, to "quacks, humbugs and impostors." Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel, but seldom found among the Allopathists.

Let us see what your heroic practice is in this era. We quote from an authority published as late as 1866. In laying down a course of treatment for inflammation of the lungs, (Pneumonia), he says: "In the first stages, blood letting, general and local, repeated, if necessary, i. e., if the pulse are *too* strong and quick; tartar emetic, mercury and opium after bleeding." "In the second stages mercury and opium are appropriate remedies, with external irritation by blisters, and expectorants containing alkali."

What would you do in a case of pleurisy? Follow your approved authors who recommend in the first stages, "full general bleeding to the extent of removing all pain, on full respiration, or the hardness of the pulse is subdued; local bleeding, followed by a poultice of hot, dry napkins, a repetition of bleeding, brisk purgatives containing mercury and antimony, tartarized antimony alone, and blisters are useful. Then mercury digitalis, calchicum, alkalies, etc., are useful to fulfil the second indications." We add also treatment for Inflammation of the Larynx. The same author says: "It is the most fatal of all inflammations, therefore the most prompt and energetic antiphlogistic course should be adopted by bleeding, calomel and antimony, before effusion takes place. Salivation should be brought about as soon as possible."

We quote once more. Dr. Hudson, at the close of his 14th lecture on fever, says: "In suffocative bronchitis, the patient's life will often depend upon the energy and watchfulness of the physician. Decoctions of senega with carbon-

ate of ammonia, boluses of camphor and carbonate of ammonia; oil of turpentine in doses of half a drachm: and in desperate cases, tincture of cantharides in 30 or 40 drop doses in combination with turpentine, have been most useful in my experience. With these should be conjoined the most liberal allowance of brandy and whiskey in the form of punch, and the use of every possible mode of external stimulation, as sinapisms, turpentine epithems, and blisters, more especially flying blisters, as recommended by Dr. Graves. 'I recollect,' said he, 'a patient whose life was saved by my pouring boiling water upon his legs, after all the above mentioned means had failed; he was fast sinking into a fatal coma in which those cases terminate, and could not be aroused by any measures which had been previously employed. The pain produced by the scalding water, however, did so most effectually, and under the use of turpentine and cantharides mixture, he eventually recovered, the only bad consequences being a large superficial sore on each leg, which, however, healed rapidly.' "

Here, my dear doctor, we have another beautiful specimen of "Old Physic," as recommended by the "regular" practice. The distinguished doctor makes one acknowledgment which presents the merits of this practice in language which leaves no room for quibbling, viz: that the hot water was more effectual than all other means used, including turpentine, carbonate of ammonia, boluses of camphor, 40 drops of cantharides, whiskey punch, sinapisms and flying blisters. When all these had failed, scalding the poor fellow's legs saved his life! What an acknowledgment! Whew!!

In 1854, we were in the city of Cincinnati, when a gentleman was fined \$300 for scalding the bristles off a hog a few moments after its throat was cut. The court adjudged it



brutality and fined him heavily. But it appears the "regular" can scald the hair off a poor suffering patient, after executing his skill in the use of depleting and torturing measures, and then recommend that as more efficient than anything else? Excuse us Doctor, from getting hair in that way, or acknowledging it superior to other means used by Homeopaths in saving the lives of our patients.

We presume they are not quite as religiously conscientious since the Catholics have got into power and prevented the use of the bible in the high schools. Should they succeed in carrying out their designs in ruling this country, banishing the bible from use, there would be plenty of the "heroic practice" outside of the "regulars," and men would be scalded before they were stuck in the throat. Pardon this digression, Doctor; we were only comparing the practice of Allopathy and Catholicism side by side.

Once more we quote, and for the present are done. For inflammation of the tongue an author prescribes: "Blood letting, decisively practiced, leeches to the lower jaw and tongue, incision into the substance of the tongue along its middle, and blisters to the back of the neck." Good God! What a practice!

#### QUERY.

We would think, from the way you and some of your patients talk, that you had had inflammation of the tongue, and that the splitting process was carried a little too far, and that two, in the room of one of those "unruly members," were made, one of which is used in extolling your merits and the beauties of Allopathy; the other in traducing us and Homeopathy. We refer to the old "Mrs. Grundys," "Widow Bedotts," and the "Misses Sniffles." In all candor we submit to your judgment which practice will be most likely

to produce lasting and life-long injury to your patients, that recommended by Paracelsus Suydenham, Helmont, Willis, Silvius, Brood, East and others which consisted of earth worms, viper's grease, volatile salts of urine, wolf's guts, hog manure, wood ticks, lice, old hats, burnt owls, swallows' nests, snakes, toads and frogs ; or the treatment recommended by Wood, Mondenhal and others of high attainments in the Allopathic ranks as quoted to cure inflammation of the lungs, pleura, larynx, or tongue, etc., etc. In the light of such practices, is it any wonder that so many candid men, when they see the beauty, virtue, mercy and cleanliness of the Homeopathic practice, gladly hail it as the tidings of great joy for the afflicted ? And shall we tamely submit to the appellations of quack, humbug, impostor, and hear your verdict of extermination, when your own authors recommend lice, wolf's guts, cat's brain, juice of cattle's manure, horse's and hog's dung, blisters, bleeding, splitting tongues, and mercurial salivation ? We think not. The people must hear both sides. They, not you who shuffle amidst worms, hot water, blisters, hog's lice, sheep-ticks and bed-bugs, cupping-glasses, cathartics, emetics, and mercurial salivation, hoar nip and cat hound, must sit as umpire upon the merits and teachings of Homeopathy and Allopathy. By the verdict of the intelligent masses we are willing to stand or fall, but not by the whining whimpers of a class of men like yourself that know nothing of the real merits of our school.

Now, sir, we ask you and your dear admirers who have united to knock us into a grease spot and to blast the "Homeopathic phantom" into nonentity, if you think there is no necessity of a further reform in the practice of medicine ? If not, then cast your odium upon us ; gather your thunderbolts and silence our little pill battery ! But if a reform is

necessary we can assure you that the growing intelligence of the people will have it. *Onward!* ONWARD! let the healing art speed its way until it shall be God-like in its office of mercy. Read carefully the few quotations we have made, and tell us which practice is best calculated to promote health and lengthen the lives of the people, that of ancient or modern Old Physic. Is not the former filthy, loathesome, and disgusting, and the latter inhuman, and more in keeping with the cruelties inflicted by savage demons and midnight assassins than the blessings of the healing art? Such a practice, and the law which renders necessary as curative agents those cruel measures under the famous or rather infamous formula of *Contra, Contrariis, Curantur*, is what Homeopathy opposes. Is it not honorable? Is it not heavenly? God hath said, "let there be light,"—and light has come.

In view of the above we should think you would blush to call yourself a professional gentleman, or labor so insidiously to crush the growing interests of Homeopathy, unless you can bring forth some argument against its merits aside from that which begins and ends with the cry of quack, humbug, impostor, etc. If our principles are all wrong, and those you have espoused all right, why don't you show it up to the public in the form of a lecture or through the press, so that we can reply? Would not that course be considered more honorable, and in keeping with the dignity of manhood, to say nothing of professional etiquette, than the effort to save a rapidly decaying system by ridicule and contempt of others. If our practice is deficient, handle us through the press, as we do you.

To deny the above quotations will only be to expose your ignorance of Allopathic practices. Do we make any assault upon anatomy, chemistry, pathology, physiology, obstetrics,

or surgery? No, verily; but like all great reforms, Homeopathy seeks to improve upon and simplify every department pertaining to the science of medicine. Nevertheless, to hear you talk, one not acquainted with our school would suppose we were trying to overthrow all scientific medication and everything of the past in relation to Allopathy, whereas the very reverse of this is true. We hold fast that which is good, and reject what we believe to be wrong and ultimating in injury to the world of mankind, viz: your law of cure which renders necessary the use of so many life-destroying elements. Is not this our privilege? Every man, woman and child is personally interested in the healing art. They all love life dearly, nevertheless confidently place it in the hands of the doctor, who can kill and then say, "mysterious dispensation of Divine providence; the Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away—blessed be the name of the Lord," when at the same time he knows the remedies he gave in such massive doses were themselves of sufficient strength to destroy life. Happy escape indeed, when you can throw the responsibility from your hands upon a merciful God and make Him the scapegoat to bear the iniquity of your wicked practice. Unhappily for you, the light emanating from the refulgent rays of our school is clearing the wilderness (darkness) or ignorance where the scapegoat used to find safety. The gates of the city of refuge are closed by the intelligence of the people against such abominations, and the blame must rest upon your shoulders. God is exonerated from these dark deeds of crime that cover the pages of Allopathic history, which hitherto have been imputed to "the ways of the Lord that are past finding out." This is the veil Homeopaths are trying to remove from the eyes of a long abused, doctor-ridden and misguided people. *Thank God, we have succeeded.*

Certainly the law upon which Allopathy predicates its practice is wrong if the Homeopathic law is right, and *vice versa*. Now sir, it is due the people among whom you practice to set the truth before them in as clear a light as possible, and as you claim to be a gentleman of the first water, to occupy the front rank in the Allopathic school, in fact, to be the *Æsculapius* of Delavan, Wis., we call upon you to expose through the press the errors, the humbuggery, the quackery, the impositions, of Homeopathy. To give you plenty of latitude, we propose a few questions and thoughts for your consideration. When you answer them we pledge ourselves to faithfully answer all you may propose to us that shall relate in any way to the science of medicine.

#### QUESTIONS FOR YOU TO ANSWER.

What is Homeopathy?

Whether is the system most susceptible to the influence of remedies—in health or in disease?

You said to me, “there are a great many good things in Homeopathy.” Please point them out, and what are its evils.

Has the size of the dose anything to do with the real points in dispute between the two schools, or is it the laws of cure upon which we predicate the different practices and the primary and secondary action of remedies?

If a Homeopathist thinks his patient needs one grain of a prescribed remedy, which he gives upon our law of cure, does it make of him an Allopathist, and save him from the odium of being a quack?

If an Allopathist thinks one-fourth, one-twelfth, one-sixteenth, or one-twentieth part of a grain is all that is necessary to be given of a certain remedy, does it make a Homeopathist of him, should he thus prescribe, and brand him as a quack, knave, or impostor?



Do Allopathists ever give remedies upon the Homeopathic law of similitude, and if so, are they quacks?

Is not the size of the dose always left to the judgment of the physician in all cases, both Homeopathic and Allopathic?

If giving a small quantity of medicine makes a quack, please give us the size of a prescribed dose which shall save us from that odium, and enable us to retain the honor and dignity of the profession.

When you graduated, were you pledged to prescribe doses of a given size, either large or small? Were you not allowed to give enough to accomplish the end sought? Homeopaths do the same.

Is it not convincing proof of a man's ability to practice medicine, when he receives his diploma from an Allopathic institution? In other words, will the faculty or board of examining physicians appointed to investigate the qualifications of students, graduate any but those qualified to practice?

Nearly five thousand Homeopathic doctors in the United States were graduates from Allopathic colleges, and have brought with them their doctorates, as mementos of honor to Homeopathy. Did the medical board sign libels when they granted those students their doctorates?

How much credit do you reflect upon Allopathic institutions when you accuse them of granting diplomas to men you call quacks, humbugs, etc.?

Your cry of quack, humbug, and impostor, against Homeopaths, places you in the following dilemma:

Allopathic colleges do graduate quacks, knaves, fools, humbugs, impostors, or they do not.

If they do graduate quacks, knaves, humbugs and impostors, then Dr. J. B. HEMINWAY is a quack, knave, humbug

and impostor, for he, as well as Homeopathic doctors, graduated at an Allopathic college.

If they do not grant diplomas to quacks, knaves, humbugs and impostors, then the Homeopathic doctors who have graduated at Allopathic colleges are not quacks, knaves, humbugs or impostors, any more than Dr. HEMINWAY.

Does it lessen a man's qualifications to practice medicine, if, after spending the usual time under Allopathic teaching, he spends an additional year in still further investigating the provings and toxical effects of medicines as taught by our *Materia Medica*? Or will you take the opposite ground and say the bigger the fool the better the doctor?

If our principles are so foolish, vile and obscene as to induce you to cry so loudly that all are quacks, knaves, humbugs and impostors, why don't you, or some other gentleman of arithmetic, scholar or scientific man in your ranks, expose them and hold them up to the gaze of the world? Three or four have, in the long space of sixty years, undertaken this job, viz: Simpson, Hooker, Palmer and Forbes. We earnestly recommend those works and the replies by Masey, Henderson and others, to your consideration.

Do Homeopaths ever shun discussing the merits of their school, or try and keep the people in ignorance in relation to the size of the dose, the law of cure, or *modus operandi* of preparing our remedies?

If there is nothing in the teachings and principles of Homeopathy, why are Allopathists so fearful of her growing power and influence? How is it that nine-tenths of all the clergy, one-half of all the lawyers, and three-fourths of all the teachers of seminaries, professors of colleges and high schools, are warm advocates of its principles. Are such men the victims of quacks and humbugs? And on the other

hand the great mass of the ignorant rabble, men who never read or think for themselves, are loud with you in the denunciations of Homeopathy? We don't say all the lower classes are Allopathists, or that all the upper classes are Homeopaths. In our cities, however, we have four-fifths of the latter and hardly any of the former, and those of your patrons in this town who denounce Homeopathy and heap their vindictive slang against us, are the "rag-shag and bob-tail" of the country. It is the same everywhere. The few refined and intellectual that patronize you give others the same privilege they enjoy—that of choosing for themselves who shall serve them.

If Homeopathic principles pervaded the world and and there was never a dose of medicine given in size above one drop of the mother tincture, or one-thirtieth part of a grain, or the 172,800th part of a pound, would it not be a blessing to mankind, lengthen life, and in every way mitigate suffering?

Why are so many hundred eminent men in the Allopathic ranks openly renouncing that practice and embracing Homeopathy, when by so doing they will ever after be assailed by a horde of non-dissenting Allopathists of the second, third, fourth and fifth classes, each of which wishes to be considered foremost in his abusive language against those dissenting from the old school? Could anything but a love for truth, the promotion of science, the elevation of the medical profession, and the good of mankind, have induced them to forsake long conceived and cherished ideas, a good practice, for the abuse of the profession and the slang and falsehoods of a lot of ignoramuses who know as little of the true principles of Homeopathy as a goose does of astronomy? To deny this will be only to expose your ignorance of the real condi-

tion of your own school and Homeopathic practitioners. In fact, nearly all our able advocates, and those occupying the front ranks in the battle, and those most likely to use the pen in defending the principles of Hahnemann, are men that have become disgusted with the Allopathic system, and turn loathingly away.

In all candor, we ask, what is the cause of all this prejudice, persecution and opposition to Homeopathy? Are we deficient in any of the qualifications which go to constitute a practitioner? If so, why don't you point them out publicly, and through the press so that the people may know for themselves. Would not this course be more consistent and in keeping with the character of a gentleman than the low, scurrilous, scheming, whimpering, sneaking, backbiting principle of calling us a quack and humbug? Have we not gone through the same regular course of study? Have we not been educated in the same school, as well as the Homeopathic? Are we less in earnest about the health and welfare of the community? Do we not labor hours for our patients where you do minutes? Are not all Homeopaths of necessity required to be constant students, full of care, toil, and deep thought and research, to gather symptoms and remedies whose pathogenetic effects are known to produce the happy results found in our practice? Are we less successful in curing disease than you? In answer to the last question consult statistics, the public, and the sexton of the cemetery. Is our practice more hazardous than yours? Was a Homeopathist ever known to kill his patient? Are not the Allopathists accused, *and justly*, of killing millions upon millions of their's? And for this reason is it not better and safer to follow the practice of Homeopathy?

Again, you say Homeopaths cure their patients by the

force of imagination. Statistics in our possession from all parts of the world where the two systems have been introduced by municipal authority to test their merits, show that we cure a large per cent. more of our patients than do Allopathists. If, then, the force of imagination, or "*Vis Medicatrix Naturæ*," is superior to your sickening doses of miserable compounds and implements of torture in restoring the sick to health, why in heaven's name don't you adopt it! You would save the patient an endless amount of suffering and misery.

To prevent any quibbling about the relative merits of the two systems, we make you the following

#### PROPOSITION :

We will select three respectable gentlemen in this place, two of whom may be friends of yours, and Allopathist in belief, and one a Homeopathist, and we will make weekly reports of the names, residences, ages, sex, and as far as propriety will admit, the diseases of our patients, how long under treatment, the number of visits, and deaths under our practice, and at the close of the year this committee shall prepare a written and sworn statement of our practice, which statement shall be published at my expense. We make this proposition, not upon our merits as a physician, but upon the superiority of our system over Allopathy in curing disease. Or, if you prefer, we will make weekly reports through the columns of the *Delavan Republican*, of the names of our patients, and every death occurring under our practice. The same proposition is extended to any Allopathist treading God's footstool. If Homeopathy is a phantom, its merits all moonshine, its practitioners all quacks, humbugs and impostors; if there is no merit, no power, no curative virtue, in infinitesimal doses over disease, this will be the best way



to let the people find it out. Then, sir, if it proves a failure, or in any way inferior to Allopathy, we will join with you in crying "away with it! exterminate the whole thing, root and branch!"

A few words in regard to the relative success of our

#### LAST YEAR'S PRACTICE,

May not be out of place, as facts are stubborn things, and speak for themselves. It is just one year to-day, (Nov. 1, 1869,) since we opened an office here, and up to the present we have not lost a single patient, unless you try to make us responsible for the Kemmet child. We do not say this boastingly, God forbid! for if there ever was a man who felt humble when battling with the ravages of disease, it is ourself; more especially when we see life waning in spite of all our efforts to save. Heaven grant that we may ever feel humble, and act accordingly.

You cannot say but that our practice has been equal to if not double your own during the year. In this period some fifty persons have slept that sleep which knoweth no waking, in Delavan and its vicinity. How many of these have died under Homeopathic treatment? Echo answers—tell us, how many? *Not one!* On the other hand, out of this number, something like twenty were your own. We would not convey the idea that we could have saved any you have lost. But we feel justified in the assertion that as you have lost twenty to our none, of all men you have the greatest reason to hold your peace, and the next time you utter your eternal excommunication against the Homeopathic system, just remember the per cent. of mortality against you. Or, when next you mount a dry goods box, on high-heeled boots, with arms akimbo, to denounce us as a quack, please remember Mr. Fisk's leg, which now hangs dangling, in consequence of

non-union of the *femur*. Had you spent half as much time in studying the principles of surgery as you do in denouncing Homeopathy, you probably would have learned what danger there is of deformity and non-union of fractures in the *femur* immediately below the trochanter, and that the upper fragment is tilted up by the action of the *psoas magnus* and *iliacus internus* muscles, and that the abductor muscles of the thigh draw the lower fragment upwards and inwards; consequently the patient should have been kept as nearly as possible in a sitting position to relax the *psoas* and *iliacus* muscles, and that of two evils it were better to have the limb a trifle short, than non-union of the fractured parts. Had the extension used been kept within the bounds of propriety, Mr. FISK would doubtless have been walking on his leg, in the room of throwing it over his shoulder to keep it out of his way. This job, and that of Mr. FRIAR, will doubtless stamp you with immortal honor as a surgeon. Probably you now remember our lamented friend, Dr. BURDICK, whom you labored so hard to have fined a few thousand for mal-practice because he was a "Homeopathic quack." Doctor, while you live in a glass house, don't throw too many stones at others, for chickens come home to roost.

We must now refer to your

### INCONSISTENT POSITION.

You have repeatedly said to your patients: "This is a Homeopathic prescription; don't be afraid of it, as it won't hurt you."

Now, sir, you did either prescribe Homeopathy, or you did not:

If you did prescribe Homeopathy, it is because you have more confidence in a prescription thus made than you would

have in an Allopathic prescription ; otherwise you acted unjustly to their interests to have made it.

If you had more confidence in an Allopathic prescription than in a Homeopathic, and still prescribed Homeopathically, you acted unjustly, and were untrue to the interests of your patients.

Therefore, in either instance, you acted unjustly to the interests of your patients, and are unworthy of public confidence as a physician.

“Ye cannot serve God and mammon” at the same time. Neither will we submit to the ungentlemanly course of the “regulars” stealing Homeopathic principles and riding into fame on the old crippled, ring-boned, spring-halted system of Allopathy. Render honor to those principles which are worthy of honor, and we will be content.

We will make this statement a little plainer by the following

#### PROPOSITION:

When you prescribe Homeopathically, you do so to cure your patients, or you do not :

If you do so to cure your patients, you virtually admit the superiority of Homeopathy over Allopathy, or you would not thus prescribe :

If you do not prescribe Homeopathically to cure your patients, you act unjustly and treacherously to their interests, and are unworthy of confidence.

You are at liberty to choose which horn of the dilemma you prefer. Should you take the first, and say you prescribed Homeopathically to cure your patients, you, in this act, admit you have more confidence in this system than your own, and every word you utter against us, is on the ground of jealousy, with a desire to do us and our labors a public and private wrong ; and when you cry “quack, humbug, impos-

tor," you utter forth the inner breathings of a small soul and narrow mind, poisoned with self love, which spends its force in vindictive expressions against a rival practitioner, who has felt it his duty to step aside from the dogmatisms of Allopathy, and, as we think, choosing and teaching a better way; and whilst you are laboring to brand us with the stigma of a quack, you have stamped the seal upon your own brow so legibly that they who run can read.

But, should you choose the other horn of the dilemma, viz: that you did not prescribe Homeopathically to cure your patients, you must admit that you have sank deep in iniquity by trifling with the lives of your fellow men in the use of remedies you utterly denounce, taking money unjustly from the pockets of your subscribers, and enriching yourself by trifling with their aches and pains.

Really, sir, we pity you. It was an unlucky ox that was gored by the horns of the lawyer bull. If the ox had kept at home, and not trampled upon the rights of the bull, he would not have been gored. If you will keep at home in your practice; act consistently; be an Allopathist or Homeopathist from principle, and act accordingly, you will save yourself this unlucky goring.

We would not discourage you, however, in the use of our remedies. We rejoice to see you crawling out of the rotten rubbish which surrounds you whilst a member of the "heroic school," but don't, we beseech you, act the part of a snail by carrying the shell to shelter your future course.

When you administer aconite and belladonna in minute doses in the first stages of scarlet fever, or aconite, Rhus-toxicodendron and belladonna in erysipelas, don't deny the fact, or say this is according to the teachings of Old Physic, when the reverse is true. Don't steal Homeopathic thunder and

give the glory to the "regular" practice, when you are among his adherents; and when you happen to be favored with a professional call to families friendly to Homeopathy, don't scrape the soles from your boots to honor her principles, and then publicly send us to old split-foot for using the same remedies. We can assure you, my dear doctor, if you cannot understand the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum, you should be able to appreciate the non-similarity between the two systems now agitating the public mind. And inasmuch as you are disposed to "feed your horse with our oats," i. e., make the people believe that all the remedies and principles you filch from Homeopathy are really the avowed teachings of your school, we will have to analyze

#### THE ALLOPATHIC LAW OF CURE.

You claim that diseases are cured by Galen's famous maxim of *Contra Contrariis Curantur*, published to the world A. D. 160.

This law, when correctly understood, means that diseases are cured by contra irritants; or, in other words, to restore the abnormal condition of the system to a normal by the use of such agents as shall produce a new or artificial disease having more power over the organism than the natural disease. To accomplish this, you have to attack a healthy organ or tissue remote from or contiguous to the one diseased, as best suits your fancy, judgment, or convenience, with a shower of Allopathic missiles, such as caustics, cathartics, emetics, blisters, cupping-glass or lancet; in fact, any remedy or appliance which will produce a revulsive, derivative, depleting or counter irritating effect. This you know to be the avowed principle of your system.

To illustrate this law of counter irritants, let us suppose you have a case with the following symptoms, viz: throbbing



bing, jumping, stabbing, or lancinating pains in the head, fullness with pressure outward, as if the brains were too large for the skull, or a sense of pressure as if the head was in a vice, dizziness or vertigo on stooping, etc. Now sir, tell us the remedies you will use Allopathically, that will produce a drug symptom, or contra pain, whose pathogenesis is contra, but curative to those of the head? Is not everything you claim as curative, discord, confusion, inharmonious, hap-hazard, random shots, prescribed without discrimination as to the pathogenetic power of the remedy? In the whole range of your *Materia Medica*, can you point out a single drug symptom or contra pain to those of the head, that you can rely upon as curative according to your law of counter irritants, revulsive or depleting measures?

Are not all your prescriptions empiric, mere guess work, given upon a routine of practice without the first shadow of relationship between disease and remedy? Can any two, ten, or forty of you "regular" gentlemen agree upon what remedy to use that shall produce a new disease, or contra irritating pains that will cure? Nay, verily!

For fear we may be condemned for this negation, we will introduce a little Allopathic practice and deduction from their experience:

Dr. A, from his examination and diagnosis of the case, guesses this head difficulty can be relieved by "kicking up a general muss with the stomach," and as the difficulty proceeds from a foul stomach, if he creates a lot of pretty hard pains in that organ, he will cure those of the head. So a few grains of ipecacuanha are poured into the epigastrium. In a few minutes the poor patient begins to feel a horrible sensation, a faint and deathly feeling, cramping and convulsions of the stomach, a sensation as if it was

drawn into knots, cutting pains and severe spasmodic action of the abdomen, followed by quick, hard and difficult breathing, coldness and cramping of the extremities, vomiting, and death-like pallor, cold sweat, etc.

This is according to the usage of Old Physic, and strictly in accordance with his law of curing disease by creating contra sufferings, or a contra disease. Having no particular rule that shall guide him in the selection of an appropriate remedy, or organ or tissue to be scourged with his wild pathogenetic views, he attacks the stomach rough shod, if peradventure he may cure, otherwise kill.

He reasons very forcibly on Allopathic principles, that any remedy or means which will produce in a healthy organ, remote from or contiguous to the one diseased, revulsive, derivative or contra sufferings, is strictly according to the teachings of Allopathy.

To sicken the stomach, vomit the patient, produce cramping, cutting, lancination and convulsions in that organ, abdomen and limbs; hard and difficult breathing, coldness and death like pallor, is upon the Allopathic law of curing disease by contra sufferings.

Therefore, to sicken the stomach, vomit the patient, produce cramping, cutting, lancinating pain with convulsions in that organ, abdomen and limbs, hard and difficult breathing, coldness, and death-like pallor, will cure the headache, because it is according to the practice and teaching of Allopathy.

Suppose this same patient, or, if you prefer, another, suffering with the same head symptoms, calls upon Dr. B. with his pitiful tale. After a little reflection he concludes to attack the bowels, hoping to reach the liver, as "he is inclined to the opinion that organ is inactive, or torpid, and must

be stirred up." So little and big intestines have to be raked broadside with "shot and shell," harrowed up with cathartics which shall lay the poor fellow out for another week. What shall it be? Little difference so the patient is put upon the trot—podophyllin, pikery, mercury, butternut bark, castor oil, glabber salts—the doctor is bound to physic the headache out through the bowels. So down goes 40 grains of calomel, more or less, followed in a few hours by four tablespoonfuls of castor oil, rhubarb, or jallap, and a few quarts of corn meal gruel. Shortly after, he begins to feel an unpleasant sensation in the bowels, followed by bloating, soreness, and tenderness on pressure, cutting pains in the abdomen, deathlike sickness, with intolerable suffering, tenessmus, or a feeling as if the whole contents of the abdomen would pass off with the evacuations. These are all contra symptoms from those of the head, and if, according to the avowed principles of your school, that disease is cured by a contra disease, then Dr. B's practice is correct. He has as much right according to Allopathic principles to attack the viscera of the abdomen with cathartics, as Dr. A had the stomach with emetics. Reasoning from the principles taught by you regular gentlemen, he says:

"That which produces in a healthy organ remote from or contiguous to the one diseased a 'contra medicinal disease,' is according to Allopathic practice."

To rake the bowels with medicines that produce soreness on pressure, bloating and cutting pains in the abdomen, deathlike feelings, and intolerable suffering whilst passing the evacuations, tenessmus, or a feeling that the whole contents of the abdomen would pass off, is upon the Allopathic principle of making a "contra medicinal disease" to cure disease. Therefore, to produce soreness and tenderness in the bowels

on pressure; bloating and cutting pains in the abdomen; deathlike sickness and intolerable sufferings whilst passing the evacuations; tenesmus, or a feeling that the whole contents of the abdomen will pass off, will cure the headache because it is on the Allopathic principles of treating disease.

Dr. C differs materially from Drs. A and B. He considers these remedies entirely inappropriate to the case. Those aches and pains produced by cathartics and emetics, though contra to the disease of the head, are in his opinion better calculated for other abnormal conditions than those for which they had been given. "I think," says Dr. C., "the true pathogenic pains to those of the head are to be found in blisters, cupping-glass, setons, mustard cataplasms, and Herrick's plasters." So he applies blisters to the calves of his patient's legs and arms, cupping glass to the temples, a seton at one end of the spine, a mustard plaster at the other, and a Herrick plaster over the abdomen. "This is rough practice," said he, "but nevertheless it is strictly in keeping with our law of contra irritants, and the sufferings consequent upon this treatment will be so much superior to those of the head, and being on the healthy part will attract the disease from the head to these parts and will therefore cure.

With Drs. A and B, he reasons as follows: "That which produces in a healthy organ remote from or contiguous to the one diseased, a revulsive, derivative or contra-irritating effect, is strictly according to the teaching and practice of Allopathy."

To blister the legs and arms, apply a cupping glass to the temples, a mustard poultice at one end of the spine and a seton at the other, and Herrick's sticking salve to the abdomen, will produce revulsive, derivative, or contra irritating pains from those of the head.

Therefore, to apply blisters to the legs and arms, a cupping glass to the temples, a seton at one end of the spinal column, a mustard poultice at the other, and a Herriek plaster of good size over the abdomen, will cure the headache, because they produce derivative, revulsive or contra irritating pains. As an auxiliary to this treatment, grandmother, who is always a privileged character among the "regulars," contributes her favorite beverage of catnip, hoarhound, and pennyroyal, also onion drafts to the feet, and a dose of castor oil to open the bowels. Oh! Hum!! Ah!!!

Dr. D. has still higher and more exalted views of the therapeutic power derived from the law of contra irritation. He also believes in depletion—the antiphlogistic treatment must be prompt, and decisively practiced. Being a regular "ring-tailed roarer" of the heroic school, it makes but little difference to him what organ or tissue is made to suffer the penalty for those of the head, or what vein he taps to draw the claret. Contra pains are to be induced; new sufferings must be instituted; a new disease is to be made; blood must flow. So he welts his patient on the nose. The blood starts. Another whack, and the stream is of sufficient magnitude to suit his ideas as to the quantity necessary to be drawn. He next punches him in the ribs, kicks him on the shin, smashes his big toe, and continues his work until the patient is full of wounds, aches and bruises. These sores he considers are better calculated to relieve the head sufferings than those produced with blisters, cupping glasses, setons, mustard poultices or sticking salve. To prevent sloughing of the flesh, and try what vitality there is in his patient, and also to arouse him from "fatal coma," he pours boiling water on his legs, then washes him with a solution of alcohol, camphor, capsicum, or salt and water. The poor victim "hops and chawks," rages



with agony and intolerable suffering. The law of contra irritants has been let loose by this "regular" gentleman on the skin and muscles. Blisters have been set aside; cathartics and emetics discarded; setons condemned; the stomach and bowels spared; nevertheless, to keep him cool he gives daily a teaspoonful of glabber salts. Should the Doctor fear that worms may set in after the treatment, he prescribes a dose of vermifuge, worm seed, cina and oil.

If your law of contra irritants is correct, the course of treatment pursued by Dr. D is just as good as that of Dr. C. You cannot object to this practice. He has as much right to make the muscles and skin sore by jamming, pounding and hot water, as Dr. C has with setons, blisters and cupping-glass. If blood must flow, he has as good reason to prognosticate relief from bleeding the nose as the arm. The measures necessary to produce contra irritants is left wholly to the judgment of the physician. Potato bugs are now becoming quite popular in the room of Spanish flies, "because," as Dr. Wheeler says, "they burn deeper." For convenience, the arm is generally used for bleeding purposes; yet we have seen the external jugular, and saphena major used for this purpose without any condemnation from the profession. If Dr. D thinks best he can select the nasal veins instead of the arm, and still be within bounds of the depleting, or blood-letting school. Full latitude being allowed, he has as good reason to suppose one contra disease will be as effectual in curing the head-ache as another. "That which will produce the end sought in the quickest and most convenient manner, should be generally chosen," was the remark of Dr. Gibson to us when speaking upon this subject. If Dr. D thinks the fisticuff treatment better calculated to promote the health and comfort of his patient than other heroic practices

of these regular gentlemen, he can give it, and still be acting more mild and humane than other practitioners of Old Physic have in former days. Dr. D, reasoning from Allopathic principles, comes to the following conclusion :

That which produces in a healthy organ or tissue remote from or contiguous to the one diseased a revulsive, derivative, depleting or contra irritating effect, is according to Allopathic law of contra irritants.

To welt a man on the nose until it bleeds, punch him in the breast and under the short ribs, kick him on the shins, smash his big toes, hammer him until he is sore from head to foot, and full of wounds and bruises, scald his legs with hot water, then wash him with a solution of alcohol, camphor, capsicum, or salt and water, will produce a revulsive, derivative, depleting, or contra irritating effect or pains from those of the head :

Therefore, to welt a patient on the nose until it bleeds, punch him in the breast and under the short ribs, kick him on the shins, smash his big toe, hammer him until he is full of wounds and bruises from head to foot, scald his legs with hot water, then wash him with alcohol, camphor, capsicum or salt and water, will cure the head-ache because it is upon the law of contra irritants.

The treatment here recommended is no imaginary case. Whilst practicing in Ottawa, Ill., we had a patient by the name of WILSON, who, unfortunately, lost his life in the late "unpleasantness" between the North and South, who had gone through a thorough course of treatment at the hands of these regular and scientific gentlemen. And with the exception of Dr. D, the treatment is only a fair representation of what he had passed through when he came to us for help.

Let us review this case for one moment, and then see if we

are not justifiable when we assert, that in the whole Allopathic library you are not able to describe a single pathogenetic symptom or pain produced by drugs, minerals, compounds or implements of torture, that bears any relationship to the head symptoms when sought upon your law of contraries. Or, in other words, a contra curative pain to those of the head is a thing unknown in the teachings of Allopathic history. If not so, describe to us a contra curative pain to those of the head.

We will examine this a little closer :

Dr. A *guesses* the difficulty proceeds from a foul stomach, and thereupon guesses an emetic will cure the headache.

Dr. B *is of the opinion* (don't know) that the liver is at fault, and must be stirred up, and upon this "don't know" opinion predicates his practice.

Dr. C calculates that Drs. A and B are wrong, and after a little reflection *reckons* the head itself is at fault, and upon this "reckon" builds his practice.

Dr. D, hearing of the failure of Dr. A's "guessing," Dr. B's "opinion," and Dr. C's "reckoning," concludes he don't know anything about the case. But as all other measures have failed, he will try the fisticuff practice, as that will be no violation of the heroic system. He prefers it to Homeopathy as it will not stamp him with the odium of a quack. Anything rather than Homeopathy.

Here not one of these regular gentlemen had the first law that pointed out a single remedy they could use with positive certainty.

One guesses he can puke the head-ache out of the mouth with emetics ;

Another, that he can physic it out through the anus with cathartics ;

A third, that he can draw it out through the pores of the skin with blisters, cupping-glass and setons ;

And a fourth through the nose by bleeding, and what's left he can hammer out through the muscles.

Really, Dr. Hooker was right when he said, "Allopathy is not one mode, one system, one thing ; it is a very diversified combination." We believe it ; anything applied in the name of Old Physic is the regular system exemplified. Oh, what a scientific class of men compose this army. Probably you would institute something else to relieve these head difficulties—we can assure you anything that your fertile intellect can think up will be good Allopathy. Let us hear what it will be.

Now, sir, you may call this abusive language, and say no such treatment is recommended. We grant that ; we were only illustrating the law of contra irritants. Yet you do recommend the head suffering to be cured by others in some part of the system otherwise free from pain. And we ask if in 2,200 years' experience you can point out in all your massive volumes, in practice, or in your *Materia Medica*, a single pain produced by drugs, minerals, compounds, or instruments of torture, that you can rely upon as positively curative for those of the head. Name to us the pathogenetic, or curative pain to be inflicted on your patient that shall relieve the head sufferings. Name the specific, point out to us positively the location and instruments of torture you would have us use. Give us the benefit of your author, and tell us the page, where a contra pain to those of the head is described, that any two Allopathists can agree upon as a specific, or curative in its application, or reliable in practice when given on your avowed principles. All is confusion, guess work, random shots, as likely to kill as cure.

A case came under our observation some 27 years past, which forcibly illustrates Old Physic, and will sustain us in the illustration of Dr. D's treatment :

A lady by the name of McKINZIE had suffered under derangement of mind for some two years. During this period she had been under the constant treatment of members of your school. The greatest vigilance was required on the part of friends to keep her from doing herself personal violence, or injury to the family. The opinion of the physicians was, that if she could be frightened by being thrown into the river, or some means used to produce a sudden emotion or shock to the nervous system, she would recover. One day it happened that a friend called to see her. The attending nurse being off her guard, the unfortunate woman made her way to the door, mounted the buggy, and started the horse of her friend at full speed. It is hardly necessary to add, that she was thrown from the carriage, a lower limb broken, her shoulder dislocated, and three of her ribs fractured, besides serious injuries in other parts of the body.

When she was restored to consciousness, which followed about one week after the injury, she was perfectly rational, and ever after continued to be. A warm dispute arose between the attending physicians as to what produced the cure. One maintained it was the fright she received, and the other that it was in consequence of the broken ribs and leg, dislocated shoulder, and other injuries she sustained by the fall, through the reaction taking place upon the law of contra irritants. If the first doctor was correct, it argues rather strongly against medicating the system by powerful Allopathic doses. If the latter view is correct, and the breaking of ribs, legs, and dislocating shoulders were the means which produced the cure, then the pounding and punching



process of Dr. D is good Allopathy exemplified, according to the famous formula of contraries. You will hardly admit the first proposition because it approximates too near to Hahnemann's views of treating the insane. If you sustain the views of the latter doctor because they follow in the wake of Allopathic experience, then you will not consider our illustration of the heroic system as overdrawn.

We have previously remarked that all was discord, confusion and inharmony in your practice. We will, however, let Allopathic authors speak for themselves, then the reader can draw his own conclusions in relation to their theory about disease and the use of remedies, and whether they give their prescriptions according to any fixed and determined laws, or in a hap-hazard, empiric way. Why should everything in nature as well as art be governed by fixed laws, and the science of medicine, the most important of all, be left to guess work, and inharmonious, discordant ideas to guide the practitioner in the selection of his remedies?

You may say all is order and system in your ranks. If so, please harmonize the following views

#### O N F E V E R ,

Which we quote for your especial benefit :

"Fever," says one, "is nothing but debility."

"Fever," says another, "is nothing but inflammation."

"Fever," says a third, "is a morbid condition of the stomach and bowels."

To meet these three conditions on Allopathic principles, the first would give brandy, wine, and stimulating remedies ; the second would bleed the patient freely ; whilst the third would give emetics and purgatives. To the credit of the more cautious and conscientious be it said, they would prefer to leave the disease to bread pills and nature, believing,

as some have expressed themselves, "that those who are left to God's providence, bread pills and cold water, have the best chance of success."

Another writer says that "all fevers arise from inflammation or irritation of the mucous membrane of the intestinal canal," which is proven from post-mortem examination of patients who die of fever, and the true practice is "to keep the patient on low diet, with cooling drinks and gum water."

Whilst another says, "fever is caused by inflammation of the brain." Therefore the patient's head must be shaved, ice applied, and a dozen of leeches to the temple—blood must flow freely, and the patient be well riddled with cathartics.

Dr. McLEOD, a Fellow of the Edinburgh College, relates what came under his own observation in the Edinburgh Infirmary, in regard to the treatment of fever:

"Three young persons, all about the same age, ill of typhus fever, were admitted into the infirmary on the same day. The diseases of all were in the same stage, and of equal severity in each case, but they were under the charge of different physicians. One would naturally expect that in the same institution and at the same period of time, the three similar cases would have met with similar treatment. But no; one patient was bled with lancet and leech; another physicked with drastic purgatives; and the third got whiskey, wine, and opium."

#### CASE FROM PERSONAL PRACTICE.

We were once called in council by friends of the patient, where two Allopathists had come at sword's points in a case of acute enteritis, or inflammation of the alimentary canal. The attending physician had recourse at once to blood-letting, copiously practiced, blisters upon the abdomen, and purgatives; leeches had also been freely used. The pa-

tient sank so rapidly that counsel was considered imperative. The second physician condemned *in toto* the practice of bleeding, blistering, or the use of leeches, contending for the use of brisk purgatives containing a certain amount of turpentine, and that mercurial salivation should be brought about as speedily as possible; each contending, (and truthfully), that he had seen the disease progress to a fatal termination under the treatment recommended by the other's practice. Both had an abundance of back proof, Allopathic authors to sustain their views. When the patient heard that the doctors could not agree, that the latter was in favor of mercurial salivation in addition to the torturing process he had already passed through, he requested to be left alone, *that he might die in peace.*

The patient passed into our hands. Mercurial salivation, leeches, lancet, and turpentine, were not used. His recovery was slow, but sure. When we last heard from him, he was, as nearly all Homeopathic converts are, an unyielding, firm, and uncompromising reformer in the practice of medicine, uttering eternal protests against everything but Homeopathy. His name is CHARLES EDWARDS. Residence, Mendota, Illinois.

#### DOCTORS AND PROFESSORS DISAGREE.

We quote again. In the University referred to, one of the learned Professors was lecturing on the subject of *pericarditis*—inflammation of the investing membranes of the heart. He spoke of the general practice of giving mercury in large doses so as to bring the system under its action as speedily as possible, combining the mercury with small doses of opium. "This practice," he says, "I believe to be erroneous; for I have observed the progress of the disease unchecked, even during profuse salivation. The most efficient rem-

edy—in fact, our sheet anchor in this disease—is tartar emetic. You will have noticed the large doses I have given of this remedy, and yet the patient seems not to suffer by it.” Four nights after in the same hall, another professor happened to lecture on the same subject, and expressed himself to this effect. “It is a remarkable thing that there should be any difference in regard to the treatment to be pursued in this disease. The Italian and French school advocate strongly the employment of tartar emetic; but I would strongly urge you to put no confidence in this remedy, for if you do you will lean upon a broken reed. Our sheet-anchor in this disease is mercury.”

Dr. Nelling says: “Squills are inadmissible when there is a tendency to inflammation, because of their stimulating effects.” Dr. Christison denies that they have any stimulating effect whatever on the circulation. Neither is there any sound reason for advocating its use in acute affections of the chest. Will you tell us who is right, and who is wrong.

Dr. Thomas believes opium a stimulant; Dr. Cullen regards it as a sedative, Dr. Mayer thinks it is both stimulant and sedative, Orfila thinks it is neither one nor the other. Were there ever such contradictory views held upon any scientific subject before? Is it any wonder that Allopathic doctors have so little confidence in the practice of medicine?

Again. The learned Dr. Bordeau tells us he was the fourth practitioner called to a patient laboring under the influence of fever, pain in the side, and bloody expectoration. “It is easy to understand,” says he, “that I had no advice to give. One of the gentlemen insisted on a third bleeding, the second on a compound purge and emetic, and the third

upon blistering the thighs. The debate raged high; neither would yield an atom, and as for myself, I could have sworn that each was right in his turn." This is but a fair representation of Allopathic practice—any course is right, and according to the law of contraries. Each physician has a right to follow his own fancy in prescribing. Cannot we therefore justly say, all is inharmony, discord and confusion, empiric prescriptions made upon a hope they will cure?

Look again, if you please, at the contradictory views on  
CONSUMPTION, AND ITS TREATMENT.

Dr. Stahl attributes its frequency to the excessive use of Peruvian bark—Dr. Morton considers the bark an effective cure. Dr. Reid argues its frequency arises from the abusive use of mercury—Brillionet asserts that this remedy is the one best calculated to cure the disease. Dr. Rush says consumption is an inflammatory disease, and should be treated by bleeding, purgatives, cooling medicines and sedatives. Salvadori says it is a disease of debility, and should be treated by tonics, stimulating medicines, and a generous diet. Galen recommends vinegar as the best preventive of consumption—Desault declares that "the use of vinegar, so common among people, produces the disease." Dr. Beddoes recommends digitalis for its cure; Dr. Parr says he found this remedy very injurious to consumptive patients. Dr. Young says it is induced by the want of proper nourishment: Dr. Lamb says, "an excessive use of animal food is among the most prompt and frequent causes of consumption." Dr. Bowls declares that "consumption is the result of some syphilitic taint, and requires the same course of treatment;" whereas, Dr. Comstock says, "only those persons have consumption, whose systems are predisposed to its ravages in consequence of a scrofulous diathesis, and that mercury only



hastens the development of tubercles." Dr. Hart maintains that it only reaches those persons who have a hereditary taint to this disease, no matter whether they have a scrofulous or syphilitic cachexy. Dr. Maer says "all ranks and conditions of men are liable to the disease, and only those persons are cured who are exposed to and have small pox." Dr. Gallager argues that it only results from the long continued use of pork, which induces a consumptive, scrofulous condition of the system. Our researches have been considerable upon this disease. Doubtless we have only reached the first letters of the alphabet in gathering the contradictory statement in regard to this malady. In the light of such testimony, the opposing views about its nature and treatment under the guidance of Allopathy, is it any wonder they are so unsuccessful in its treatment? With these heterodoxical views and contradictory opinions in relation to its origin, theory of practice, can we be at a loss to define the reason of its gradual increase? And are we not justifiable in the opinion that all is confusion, guess-work, and discordant views? Will you inform us which of the authors quoted you consider good Allopathic practice? Or will you discard them all and follow those of Von Hufeland, who recommends four ounces of raw beef, with an equal quantity of pulverized sugar, to be made into boluses, and given daily to the patient; or Dr. Judd's theory of giving 4 wine-glassfuls of good old bourbon whiskey at intervals of six hours; or Dr. Churchill's hypophosphates of lime and soda; or Hoffman's preparation of human excrements, (see Henderson, page 191); or will you extol cod liver oil, manufactured from hog's lard, catfish brains, sturgeon spawn, not forgetting to grease the nose and soles of the feet with goose grease to loosen the cough and keep down the snuffles. In all candor, Doctor,

what idea can you entertain of your own system when reviewing its history? Can you with your fertile intellect conceive of anything more filthy than has been forced into the stomachs of their patients from the hands of old school practitioners! If so, proclaim it from the house top, for we cannot.

We again quote from Stockburn in relation to the views propagated by the regular gentry about

### DELIRIUM TREMENS:

Armstrong thinks it arises from venus congestion in the brain and liver, consequent upon the activity of the heart and arteries, increased by irritation.

Playfair thinks it arises from a morbid state of the liver and intestinal irritation.

Golden says it has its seat in the solar coeliac plexus, and looks upon the affection of the brain as merely sympathetic.

Clutterbuck thinks it is the consequence of inflammatory action of the arachnoid and pia-mater.

Hufeland believes it to be only a passive nervous delirium; whereas Stokes says there are two kinds of it: one consists in diminished irritability, the other of increased irritability.

Dr. Hardy, being asked while attending a patient suffering under the hallucinations of this disease "to what cause he could attribute those strange phenomena," replied, "because the man is a d—d fool, and got drunk."

Which author will you sustain?

Every one has his own peculiar theory, and thereupon builds his practice. In view of these different opinions, alleged facts directly at variance with each other, have we drawn anything but a fair inference between the practices of Drs. A, B, C, and D? Could any man of a reflecting mind, when comparing causes and effects, come to any other con-

clusion! Prof. Henderson, Allopathist, page 209, says, "Medicine is no exact science," and further on, "a system of empiricism depending on the fitful caprice, taste and judgment of the practitioner."

As a final quotation showing the caprice, taste, and judgment of another Allopathic author, Hoffman, we refer you to Henderson, page 191, where you will find, "water from animal's dung, oil of excrements, and hen-dung, for colic; swallow's dung for epilepsy; peacock's dung for diseases of the head, giddiness, epilepsy; poultices made from cows and human manure," and fifty other things, equally as absurd. We have before us three Allopathic recipes, one containing 33, another 61, and the third 72 ingredients, among which several species of stone, human flesh, dried mummies, and viper's flesh, are included.

We have quoted enough to convince any one with an unprejudiced mind that when we asserted all was confusion, discord, and inharmonious, incoherent ideas, without system, law or order, in Allopathic principles, we spoke advisedly.

How different with our system! There is no confusion in our law. The Homeopathist prescribes to meet certain symptoms which are known to exist by the pathological condition of his patient, with certain remedies which, from experiments on the healthy organism, are known to be capable of producing similar, but not contrasufferings. He fears and carefully avoids the poisoning and deleterious effects following the use of large doses. He aims to give such a remedy as will act on the diseased part, and in such a quantity as shall suffice to bring about a natural reaction against disease in the very organ where the natural disease is spending most of its violence. Therefore, let ten thousand persons go to as many Homeopathic physicians, complaining of vertigo on

stooping, fullness of the head, throbbing of the temples and carotid artery, boring and pressing pains in the head, sensation of weight in the head, dilation of the pupils, feeling of expansion of the brain, boring of the head into the pillow, etc., and they will all prescribe belladonna, because they know that this remedy will produce, when administered in poisonous doses, a "like," or corresponding suffering. The corresponding pathogenetic effect will be derived from minute doses of helleborus niger, hyoscyamus, aconite, glononine, etc., which we most respectfully recommend to your consideration when prescribing for cerebral difficulties, and we assure you that the same happy results will follow that you have so recently experienced in the Homeopathic use of aconite and belladonna in scarlet fever. All we ask, doctor, is, that when you filch our remedies or use your own on the law of similitude, be honest-hearted and tell the truth, without dissembling. There will be none of the bad effects following their application which we so often witness under the guardianship of the

#### HYDRA-HEADED MONSTER OF ALLOPATHY,

As exemplified in the use of caustics, blisters, cupping-glass, scalding water, and red-hot irons, or other instruments of torture in common use by the regular gentlemen. If you should see us treat a patient as recommended by our illustration of Dr. D's practice, you would utter eternal oaths of condemnation, and well you might. But this is mild, merciful, humane and God-like, compared to what is actually done in millions of cases by the heroic school, of which you boast of being a modern Celsus.

Witness the works of this arch demon, under the garb of mercy applying the most cruel instruments of torture, the effects of which eternity alone can unfold. And even now,

without the blush of modesty, in the noonday sun of the nineteenth century, boasting of a practice which during the last two thousand years has done more harm to the world than war, pestilence or famine. Its greatest glory appears to be in boasting of its antiquity, and in order to maintain a miserable existence, assumes to itself knowledge supreme; issues bulls of extermination against Homeopathy, as a right, because he has no arguments to present against its merits but the cry of quack, humbug, fool, impostor, small-pill doctor, etc. Before you proceed further with these logical arguments against those who conscientiously practice in the reform school, call together the grand sanhedrim of "regular gentlemen," and deliberate upon the writhing influence of blighting disease which has followed in the wake of the boluses your practitioners have crammed by force into the stomachs of their patients. For twenty smoldering centuries it has been telling its tale of woe and anguish. In vain was the cry for mercy at their hands.

Men, women and children alike have been made the victims of this jargon and heterogenous practice. But, thank God, this wicked and unchristian-like system is fast being removed by a better way. We are stopping the use of those deathly appliances which constitute the major part of this heroic practice, through the light emanating from the Homeopathic system. You should have learned ere this how vain and futile are your efforts in hurling your puny missiles at the Homeopathist who is sweeping broadcast the little remaining influence left in the hands of the old school practitioners. No longer will legislative bodies enact laws to protect your craft and crush the Homeopathist. You cannot entrench yourself behind your self-conceit or hoary age. Neither will the tottering pyramid that from antiquated days



has been rearing its dire head, longer withstand the sweeping influence of our school. You may prop it up by the envy, hatred, and vindictive spirit, which as a body, you are trying to throw upon those who step aside from supporting its blood-stained banner, or refuse to follow in the wake of his dogmas or superstitions.

Compare the practice recommended by Dr. D with the history of Allopathy; view the crimes perpetrated in the dark; the poisonous doses given by the hands of ignorant practitioners; and then tell us if the fisticuff practice of Dr. D is not more mild, merciful, and humane than that instituted by other members of Old Physic in hundreds of instances.

Reflect upon the countless millions slain by the massive doses of miserable compounds empirically given, and then stop making up mouths at Homeopathists because their remedies don't kill at first sight.

The spirits of those murdered hosts rise to high heaven in holy indignation against such cruel barbarities. The errors and crimes of Allopathy have left too many landmarks and buoys of warning, for the rising generation longer to seek shelter from appalling disease under his guidance. Aye, this boasted juggernaut of antiquity is covered o'er with hieroglyphics pointing out the dark deeds of his past history. Wrecks of humanity, phanths pale and haggard, walking skeletons of human suffering, follow in the wake of his practice, exhibiting palsied limbs, emaciated frames, caroused bones, rotten teeth, and ulcerated throats, experiencing pain and suffering more acute than that inflicted by the cruelties of the *auto-da-fe*, crying as they journey, "*Behold the fruits of your fiendish practice!*" pointing to your boasted pyramid upon whose dome stands Death with his scythe, a

fit emblem of Old Physic, crying, "I gather them in! I gather them in!" Look at your mercurialized patients, with "sloughing gums, swollen and protuberant tongues, ulcerated mouths and throats, breath more offensive and pestiferous than the poisonous Bo-hon-upas," followed by "gastro-enteritis, mercurial erethism, dysentery, cutaneous eruptions, inflammation of the periosteum and bone, excessive derangement of the nervous system, paralysis, tremors, tumors, rotten livers, necrosis of the bone and jaws, mouth and cheeks destroyed, teeth decayed, rheumatism, consumption, and dropsy," all legitimate fruits of Allopathic practices, and then tell us if the treatment recommended by Dr. D, on page 56, is not more mild, merciful and humane than that of any old school practitioner who upholds and sanctions by usage the measures resulting in the catalogue of ills enumerated above. In conclusion, Dr. D can reason very plausibly upon the following

### HYPOTHESIS:

The Allopathic principle of curing disease by revulsive, derivative, depleting, or contra-irritation, is true or it is not:

If it is true, D's process of producing a revulsive, derivative, depleting, or contra-irritating effect, is according to the Allopathic formula.

If it is not true, then the premises are false, and the whole Allopathic theory of curing diseases by a revulsive, derivative, depleting, or contra-irritating effect, tumbles to the ground.

If this law be true, and the means sought to accomplish the end are left wholly to the discretion of the practitioner, then Dr. D has violated no law or principle of Allopathy, and his treatment is just as correct, according to your theory, as that of Drs. A, B, C and D, or any other you may personally

institute. Each practitioner has his particular views how the revulsive, derivative, or contra-irritating effect is to be brought about. "That it *must* be done, and *not* the means to be used, is what mostly interests us," was the remark of Dr. Landen when conversing with us upon the antiphlogistic treatment. Drs. A, B, C and D entertain the same opinion still.

We leave it for you to choose between Allopathy of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The blood-letting, cathartics, emetics, blisters, setons, cupping glass, splitting of tongues, scalding water, hot tar, and mercurial salivation, exhibited by your school, and, with one or two exceptions, strongly recommended in 1860 by Mendenhall, Wood and others of high authority; or the expressed juice from cattle's manure, horse dung, water of oxen, sheep or cows, blood of hogs and men, maiden's hair, old burnt owl and shoes, old charred hats, powders of stag's tails, boar's teeth, man's skull, volatile salts of earth worms, viper's grease, crab's eyes, burnt swallows, wolf's guts, pigeon's gizzards, swallow's nests, hog's manure, hog's lice, sheep ticks, wood lice, and bedbugs.

Such was and is Allopathy. The people must choose for themselves what practice they will have, and who shall serve them. Truly, you have great reason to boast of scientific attainments. No wonder all the men of science, gentlemen of arithmetic and scholars of eminence are found in your ranks.

Probably, my dear doctor, the reason so many Allopathists are making up faces at Homeopathists, is because we discard from practice so many rich delicacies exhibited in your practice, as quoted above. For this reason you are justifiable in your bitter denunciation of the reform school, and

in justice to community we should "knock under," hold our peace, and tamely submit to the cry of quack, humbug, and impostor. Truly, you should be elevated to the throne of judgment, and being legally empowered by members of Allopathic colleges, with your docurate in one hand, and a dose of boar's teeth, sheep ticks and hen-dung in the other, call us poor deluded Homeopathic quacks to the bar of justice, and pass sentence of condemnation against us for telling the people there is a better way of curing the head ache, than to blow it out at the posterior extremity with drastic cathartics, or draw it out through the legs and arms with blisters, or arouse the patient from a fatal coma with whiskey punch, or scalding the hide with boiling water, hot tar, or burning the skin and flesh with red hot irons.

In concluding this part of our letter, we must apologize for the rough-and-tumble manner in which we have handled you and the system you pretend to follow. But really, sir, it has been done without any feeling of disrespect towards you as a man. Had you presented any argument against our system besides the constant cry of "quack, humbug, impostor," etc., we would have had something else to base our remarks upon; but as this has been the "mountain which in labor you have brought forth," we had to meet it upon the merits it deserved. Should you, or any other person, call them ungentlemanly, we can only say, that no part is more so than the quotations we have made from your own authors. The little sarcasm we have indulged in must offset your efforts to brand us as "a carpenter that had just sold his tools for a case of Homeopathic medicine and begun to practice."

We admit that the quotations from Allopathic works are dirty, filthy trash, and ought not to find their way to the pages of any book. We would, however, rather see them there,

than take their contents into our stomachs. If your dear admirers, and the lovers of Old Physic would prefer the other course, they can let the book alone and take their fill of "hog's lice, alive, nine at a time, sheep ticks, worms, snakes, toads, and frogs," which have been freely used and recommended by Suydenham and others, as quoted from him, pages 86, 177, 255, 104, 451, 2, 3, 6, and 166.

Should you dodge the point, and call this ancient Allopathy, we refer you and your adherents to Mendenhall's *vademecum*, pages 634, 635, 636, and 637, published in 1866, where blood-letting, blisters, purgatives, emetics, splitting of tongues, mercurial salivation, and other implements of torture are freely recommended.

We are not attempting to force Homeopathy upon you, or the people. We do, however, propose that whilst you are using your astute intellect in trying to crush us on the ground that Homeopathy is "a phantom—a name without a substance," and that all her practitioners ought to be exterminated, root and branch, because we are "a race of quacks, humbugs and impostors," denouncing all dissenters from Allopathy in our ranks as "knaves, or fools," that the people shall know something about the relative merits of the two systems, and more especially, why Homeopathy is so effectually overthrowing the principles and practice of Allopathy.

From the foregoing illustrations, and extracts from Allopathic authors, both ancient and modern, you will perceive why so many thousand leading practitioners are forsaking his ranks and joining the Homeopathic. Many are yet halting between two opinions; but investigation will reveal the better way. Others, and they are numbered by the thousand, for the want of a support try to live by choosing lesser evils, turn landlords, open billiard saloons, grog shops, penny-grab



drug stores, and become retailers of fire crackers, negro doll-babies, wooden toys, comic pictures, patent pills, glabber salts, gim-cracks and corn-poppers ; uttering falsehoods and foul calumnies against their neighbors, all of which occupations they grace equally as well as the dignity of the medical profession, and are doubtless doing the world more good in this way, than when trying to be a doctor. Without doubt there are many more that would grace a circus ring, becoming clown, turning somersaults, a player at mumble-peg, thimble-riggers, black-legs or clock-tinkers better than the honorable dignity of the medical profession, and will be doing posterity infinitely less harm than in dealing out death and destruction on Allopathic principles.

---

Having given you a little sprinkling of the old school theory and practice, we invite your attention to the second part of our letter upon some of the more important

#### PRINCIPLES OF HOMEOPATHY.

To illustrate these, we must again refer to those of your school. Galen, about the year A. D. 160, adopted your favorite maxim of *Contraria Contrariis Curantur*, which rapidly led to the introduction of those harsh appliances enumerated above, and which constitutes the major part of Allopathic practice, your argument being, "that by the use of those agents in parts remote from, or contiguous to the one diseased, you can overcome by an artificial disease of superior power the disease under which the patient is laboring." Therefore the antiphlogistic counter-irritants, revulsive, derivative and depleting measures naturally followed in the channel prepared by Galen.

He, like every other man of power and will force, soon gathered around him followers whose influence crushed every opposing view, until, like Mahomet, with sword in hand they carried their instruments of death into every family. It is therefore easy to trace to its origin why the use of caustics, blisters, setons, cathartics, emetics, diaphoretics, expectorants and lancet found their way into general use. Such has been the force of habit and the power of Allopathy, that these winged instruments of destruction were held in as much devotion by the people, as the heathen Hindoo does the rolling car of juggernaut or the great spirit sleeping on the bosom of the Ganges. And now that that influence is about to be discontinued by the mighty power of the great Homeopathic reform, it is not to be wondered at that the same spirit of intolerance which has ever marked the history of Allopathy from the early days of Hippocrates, Æsculapius and Galen down to the present era should be so vigorously used in its defense.

To illustrate this practice: The Allopathist considers it necessary to reduce the system in many instances so that it shall have less power to resist the means they are using to overcome the natural disease. This is termed the antiphlogistic treatment. Thus Mendenhall says of laryngitis, or inflammation of the larynx, "that it is the most fatal of all inflammations, and a most prompt and energetic antiphlogistic treatment should be adopted by bleeding, calomel, and antimony, before effusion takes place. Salivation should be sought as soon as possible."

We make this quotation as an illustration of Allopathic treatment and the end sought to be accomplished by the law of contra-irritants and depletive measures.

In very many cases of inflammation you resort to blood-

letting, as well as blisters, cupping-glass, and mercurial salivation. In fact, until the introduction of Homeopathy these means were relied upon as your "sheet-anchor." It appeared to be the only agent that you really boasted over in inflammatory attacks. In a word your great Allopathic problem is solved by reducing and contra irritants.

To accomplish your designs drugs are employed in a crude form, and in massive doses, leaving them offensive to the taste, nauseating to the stomach, and in consequence of their indigestibility, they irritate the gastric folules, inducing disorder of the stomach and a long train of intestinal diseases and chronic difficulties too numerous to mention. The chronic diseases and sufferings consequent upon these potent remedies are not the only evils resulting from the Allopathic system; for the size of the dose, and the means necessary to reduce the system and produce the contra irritation, necessarily induces sympathetic affections, which, mingled with the natural disease, renders it impossible to distinguish between the two classes of symptoms, or to judge whether the malady or the medicine, or the union of the two forces combined, are killing the patient.

You cannot deny that in the administration of your drugs you endeavor to make use of those agents which, according to the strict tenets of your system, spend their force on organs or tissues which are healthy, and remote from those diseased, on the ground that revulsive, derivative, or counter-irritants serve to attract the fluids from their natural affection to the new or artificially diseased organs or tissues, your argument being that "two diseases of a contra nature can exist in the system at the same time, and that according to the law of mechanics the weaker must yield to the stronger. Therefore, when a natural disease has usurped

temporary control over any organ, you aim to suppress its action by creating a new artificial disease contra to the one the patient is suffering under; and as you have no law of specific action, no guide that shall dictate to your mind the dependent action between remedies and disease, you resort to the use of any instruments of torture which serve to assist in this purpose, or any remedial agents which will produce a contra medicinal disease. Consequently, the whole system must be brought under the influence of medicinal poison to overcome any local ailment. The result is, that the patient is forced to bear a double burthen of ill, rendering the chance for his recovery less, in proportion to the severity of the means employed, and the remedial agents exhibited.

To analyze this more clearly, we lay down three acknowledged facts: First, disease will destroy life; secondly, medicines in sufficient quantity will also destroy life; and thirdly, remedies in doses sufficient to produce suffering, poison the system. For we contend that whenever a remedy is given which produces marked medicinal symptoms, attended by acute suffering, the patient is laboring under the influence of a poison; and those pains and symptoms are but a prelude to the death-struggle they would have to pass through had the same drug been given in doses sufficient to destroy life. Let us illustrate: If 10 grains of strychnine would produce death by convulsions, 5 grains would half accomplish the work,  $7\frac{1}{2}$  grains would destroy three-fourths; add the other  $2\frac{1}{2}$  grains and life is destroyed. This must be, or the last  $2\frac{1}{2}$  grains would not have completed the work of destruction. If 8 glasses of brandy will make a man drunk, two will do one-quarter; four, one-half; six, two-thirds; or the seventh and eighth would not complete the filthy, disgusting sight.

The death symptoms of strychnine are violent spasms of

the whole body ; cramping and convulsions of the stomach and œsophagus ; inability to swallow ; jaws firmly set ; hands and face livid ; eye-balls protruded ; imperceptible pulse ; finally death comes to the sufferer's relief. In giving simply an overdose of this remedy we have seen these symptoms, but in a less aggravated form. Within a few days past, we gave 10 drops of the third decimal attenuation in a glass half full of water, and tetanus followed. Hence it is evident that medicines and disease will destroy life.

To illustrate the point we design to make, let us suppose the life force of a man to be 60 pounds, and that disease and drugs will destroy it. A is attacked with some acute disease. His life force is supposed to be 60 pounds. The doctor, on arriving, finds him rapidly sinking, and judges from appearance that one-third of his physical force is destroyed. He becomes alarmed at this condition, and forthwith proceeds to arrest a further waste of his physical energies by disease. How does an Allopathist accomplish this ? By creating a contrary disease in the healthy organs or tissues remote from the natural disease, which shall over balance, by a superior force, the one under which the patient is suffering. To accomplish this, you resort to emetics, cathartics, blisters, cupping glass and lancet. Are not these means life-destroying ? Do they not tend to rapidly weaken and destroy the physical force or vital energies of the patient ? Suppose you have accomplished your design and removed the disease ; the result is, the disease has destroyed one-third of A's life, the medication one-third, and hence there is but one-third of the physical force left to build upon.

To carry this illustration a little farther, we will suppose A to be attacked with pleurisy, a disease which terminates fatally if not arrested in a few hours. The doctor says, this



man can live but a short time in this condition—one-half of his physical strength is destroyed. To cure this, you must attack the remaining life of the patient with the most prompt, active, and decisive measures of the heroic practice. Your treatment in the first stages is “to bleed to depletion,” “bleed till the patient faints.” “Full general bleeding to the extent of removing all pain on full respiration, or the hardness of the pulse is subdued. Local blood-letting, if necessary, brisk purgatives containing mercury and antimony; tartarized antimony alone, and blisters. Then mercury, digitalis, calchicum, alkalies, &c., will be useful to fulfil the second indications. Should the disease happen to be transferred to the opposite side, which generally follows after bleeding, the same routine of practices should be followed.” “Through the second and third stages counter-irritation should be used.” We have made these quotations from your own authors so there shall be no room for dispute. We ask in the name of high heaven, if such a course of treatment would not destroy one-half of the life force of any man? Would not the energies of the life represented as 60 pounds be reduced to 30? Reason answers. It follows then, that the remedies which have extracted 30 of the 60 pounds, and the disease that had destroyed 30 pounds, previous to the doctor’s arrival, accomplishes the work of death, as the legitimate results following when these two destroying elements are both working upon the system.

I am aware that to evade this argument, you will ridicule the idea of representing the life force of man by numerical numbers, or pounds. You must, however, admit that life is something, and that disease and drugs are something; and that this disease and drug something will destroy, blot out, or remove this life something.

Now, whether is it easier for this life something to overcome both of its enemies, when they are at work in their efforts to destroy it, or to overcome the disease something alone? For our part, we will recommend mother Nature. Or in other words, every disease to which man is liable will yield to the force of the system, uncontaminated by the influence of drug or medicine under the law of contra irritants and depletion, better and more sure than under the death-like missiles given from Allopathic hands. The argument, then, rests here. Inasmuch as remedies given under Allopathic law have a tendency to reduce and destroy the life force, it lessens, in the same ratio, the chances for the restoration of the patient. And inasmuch as the chances of recovery of the patient will be in the same ratio as the life principle is nourished and protected, and as the practice of Homeopathy does protect and sustain the life force longer and better than Allopathy, therefore Homeopathy is just in the same ratio superior to Allopathy.

If you saw a man suspended over a yawning gulf by a three-stranded rope, you would concede it an act of cruelty if any person should cut two of the three strands. You would consider the life of the man in imminent danger if you could not immediately put forth your hand and save him. The three strands, when wound together, strengthen and support each other, rendering his life comparatively safe. But on cutting the two, the third rapidly unwinds, until the man takes his death-leap into the unfathomable gulf below. In like manner we may compare the life of man to a three-fold cord, upon which he is suspended. When disease attacks his system, there is an effort to sever one, or all of the strands composing this life cord. The question arises, shall we help to sever still further the life cord of the patient, or shall we try and keep it bound together? Let reason answer. With

all our efforts, we sometimes find it very difficult to keep this delicate cord from snapping asunder. The severity of the disease too often severs the major part of this vital force. To give Allopathic doses, or medicine upon their avowed principles, will soon snap asunder the remaining strength of the patient's life, and he takes his last sleep.

Not so under the guidance of a skillful Hhomeopathist. When he finds that disease has severed one portion of this life cord, he protects and sustains the remainder. No depletion by the use of the piercing lancet. No torturing by blisters and cupping glasses. No convulsions and death-like agonies, from emetics and drastic cathartics. No appliances that render the suffering of the patient more acute and severe than the disease. No chronic medicinal disease follows his practice. No suffering that renders life a constant dread. Can you say this? nay, truly. When you stand by the death bed of your patient and see life fast ebbing; when you place your finger upon the radial artery, and feel the pulse beating fainter and fainter still, when the heart makes its last effort and the last breath escapes, when the spirit has departed from its *tortured prison-house*, beyond the grasp of this murderous practice, you know that just in proportion to the size of your dose, and its operation on the system, just in the same ratio have you cut that life short, and hastened it to a premature grave.

To overcome the difficulty which you have to encounter in this critical condition, you resort to your "*Life Preservers*," under the form of tonics. To illustrate this principle we give the following case which came under our observation. A gentleman had been attacked with inflammation of the lungs, and for ten days had been under Allopathic treatment. Fearing the ultimate results would be unfavorable, the friends in-

sisted upon our being called as counsel. On arriving we found the patient struck with death. He had gone through with the regular practice, had been bled, blistered, and purged, until the life force had nearly ebbed. Hearing the doctor give orders to have him take a large table-spoonful of that *stuff*, once in 15 minutes, we were led to enquire what it was?

"Tonics."

"What kind?"

"Brandy and Quinine."

"What are you giving that for?"

"To raise him."

"I think he will be lowered instead of raised unless he be so fortunate as to reach heaven."

"He has been a very sick man; to break up this disease we have had to resort to *active treatment*."

"You aimed to reduce him, did you?"

"Yes."

"Did you bleed him?"

"Yes, twice, both general and local."

"How much blood did you take each time?"

"I bled him until he fainted. I took about a pint at each bleeding, in all about six pounds."

"Did you blister him?"

"Yes, heavily."

"Did you use cathartics?"

"Yes, of mercury and opium; I also gave two emetics, as I found the stomach in a bilious condition."

"Did he vomit easily?"

"No, he convulsed severely."

"What did you do in the second stage?"

"I continued the use of opium and mercury, with external irritants by blisters."

"Did the blisters fill well?"

"No—and fearing an effusion of water, I applied the cupping glass three times."

"Did you succeed in allaying the inflammation and reducing the fever?"

"Not wholly; the pulse, though weak, were from 90 to 100."

"Why not continue this treatment now, as in the beginning? the same indications demand the same treatment to be continued, do they not?"

"Yes; but the patient has got so low, that I dare not continue the course another moment, for fear he would die under the effects of the treatment. I have therefore put him on tonics, to build him up, or sustain him, as he is running down so rapidly."

"Now, doctor, be candid, and in the fear of God tell me whether this man has not suffered more from the effects of your treatment during the last ten days, than he did from the disease. Or, in other words, has not your treatment done more towards destroying his life than the disease?"

"I will not admit that, yet I know the man has been very much reduced by the potent remedies, and the means I have used for his recovery. *But it's according to the books.*"

"Could a well man, say this patient, have passed through this treatment, and been able to sit up?"

"He might, and he might not. It would depend upon his vitality. I think the man could not."

As harsh and barbarous as this treatment was, it is, nevertheless, in perfect keeping with *all the teachings of Allopathy*, and in strict compliance with their literature, both ancient and modern. Now I leave it to the intelligence of my readers to judge, whether this man was not hastened to his grave by this Allopathist? *Echo answers yes.*



Under Homeopathic treatment, all these life destroying elements are thrown to the winds. *All* the suffering and untold misery wantonly applied by their fiendish practices, is prohibited. Hence, we nourish and sustain the strength and vitality of the patient, mitigate his sufferings in the same ratio that we discard the torturing practices of the Old School.

This accounts partly for the superiority of Homeopathy over Allopathy, and gives a satisfactory reason why in all our hospital reports, where the two practices are introduced, that we cure on an average, taking all diseases reported, 36 1-10 per cent. more of our patients. It is but little over half a century since the first introduction of Homeopathy to the medical world. Since then, the average life of man has increased in Germany, France and the United States 6 1-10 years. In England, Scotland and other old foggy countries, where the intelligence of the people is kept in the back-ground by the influence of Allopathy, life does not increase but in a small ratio, and that is about in proportion to the hold that our practice has upon the people. This fact has become so evident that life assurance companies are advertising to take risks on those persons who reject Allopathic practice and adhere strictly to Homeopathy, for ten per cent. less than if they were the supporters of the old foggy principles of medication. Truly the world moves.

But before we close this part of our letter, we will give a passing remark on your boasted *Life Preserver*, in the form of tonics or stimulants. For many centuries your labored efforts were to keep the people in ignorance as to the nature of your remedies, and depleting process. Had the friends of patients known that it was the remedies, in the room of the disease, that gave the death like appearance, you and your medicines would have been politely shown to the door. But

since the dissemination of the principles of Homeopathy, they have learned that the anguish and suffering, the deathly sickness, fainting and sinking spells, are in a large majority of cases owing to the action of your drugs, and deathly appliances of empiricism in the room of the disease. Your clever hit of attributing the sinking spells to the turning point in the disease is fast being "played out." This "letting the patient down," is getting to be pretty well understood. Hence this dodge can only be used among the ignorant, or those that know but little about the true principles of medication. Happy escape from censure and responsibility! When the boys were pelting the frogs to death with stones, one of them is fabled to have said: "This may be sport for you, but it is death to us." Hitting the patient with your deathly drugs may be sport for you, but it is death to the afflicted. Poor frogs, wicked boys—poor invalid, naughty doctors. Unlike the boys, the Allopathists seem to be sorry they carried their pelting process quite so far, and when they see life going out like the flickering of a candle in its socket, they hastily resort to their "tonics" in the form of brandy, quinine, &c., expecting by this means to give back that which they have destroyed. We will assure these gentlemen it is difficult to improve the handiworks of God; and we doubt whether the brandy and quinine can give back the life they have cruelly helped to destroy.

For illustration, we will admit yours to be the true law of cure. The old adage is, "a good rule will work both ways." We have a case, say inflammation of the lungs, treated by a strict Allopathic rule, of contra irritants, bleeding, mercury and opiates. This treatment must "let the patient down" to death's door. Every indication justifies the conclusion that life is near its close. The doctor now begins the use of

brandy and quinine. The heart beats stronger, the pulse is full, the cheeks look flushed, hope begins to rise in the minds of surrounding friends. But mark you, his respiration is more difficult, delirium follows, the eyes change in appearance. Why? Simply because the balance of the natural life is being overcome by an artificial force or stimulant, brandy and quinine, until it quietly goes out the same way that the medicinal disease removed the natural, viz: by a superior force. The remedies and appliances used to cure inflammation created a contrary disease to the natural one, and drove it out by force. Now brandy and quinine create a disease contrary to the medicinal disease, and the operation of building up these two artificial medicinal diseases destroys the life of the patient. The reason is plain: During the primary action of the brandy and quinine, the system appears to gain strength. In their secondary action they live upon the system and nervo-vital force of man; therefore, they are not only useless, but actually detrimental, in all conditions of health and disease, and rapidly destroy life. This must be so; should you assume an opposite ground of reasoning, it overthrows your law of cure, and establishes H<sup>o</sup>meopathic principles.

We contend that inasmuch as these stimulating agents are not claimed to be curative, they do infinitely more harm than good. The acknowledged experience of every man who has used stimulants of any kind is, that just in proportion as these means raise the natural life above its normal standard, just in the same ratio will the system fall below its normal stand point as soon as they are discontinued. The H<sup>o</sup>meopathist rejects stimulants and is consequently never forced into this dilemma. We nourish the sinking man, but do not create an artificial medicinal stimulated disease.

Experience in nature gives abundant proof to sustain our theory. If an old school doctor had half a dozen choice fruit trees in his garden, and in consequence of some unknown cause they had become diseased, he would not order his gardener to throw boiling water on them, or to peel off the bark, tap, girdle, or cut off half the roots. Yet it would be just as consistent as to attack a sick person with lancet, emetics, cathartics, blisters, leeches and cupping-glass. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. What's reasonable in one case, is common sense in the other. Why not use the trees in this rude, harsh, reckless manner? Simply for the reason that it would destroy them. What should be done? The body and main limbs should be rubbed with a rough linen cloth; washed in soap and water; the earth loosened around the roots, and richly manured; every effort should be made to nourish and sustain the life of the tree. The doctor would rave like a madman if his gardener had peeled the bark, tapped, girdled, cut off half the roots, or poured boiling water upon them. He would say, "the fool has killed all my choice fruit trees." Not too fast, doctor. His course of treatment for the tree is a *fac simile* of yours for your patient. He pours on boiling water, you pour in emetics and cathartics; he peels the bark, you peel the skin with blisters and cupping-glass; he taps, you bleed; he girdles, you salivate; he cuts off the life and vitality by cutting off the roots, you sever the life force by your depleting process; he kills the tree, you kill the patient. You say he's a cabbage-head to think his treatment of the tree would keep it from dying, the public are beginning to say the same about the life-destroying practice of the Allopathist. You hold him responsible for the loss of the trees, Homeopathsists hold you responsible for the death of your patients when you destroy their

lives by your heroic practices. You advise the gardener to use common sense, so do we advise you. We also assure you that our children, wives, husbands, fathers and mothers, are quite as dear to us as your trees are to you, and we ask *humanity at your hands*.

To accomplish this, the orthodox school selects that medicine which has cured a disease having the same name, without reference to the relationship of the remedy to the disease, or one which you *guess* will cure from a routine of practice derived from the law of *contra sufferings*.

He also gains his supposed knowledge of the therapeutic action of remedies by trying them upon the sick, or upon cats, dogs, rabbits, etc. If they stand the dose without dying, it is good Allopathic experience, and forthwith man becomes the victim of this dog medicine. From their botanical and chemical properties they also *infer* their medicinal use.

Being without any true law to gather the therapeutic action of remedies, they administer as many different kinds together as their fancy may dictate, with the hope to reach every part of the system at once. Many of the remedies acting in direct contradiction to each other, must necessarily destroy the curative virtue on the part diseased, and create new medicinal disease, which renders life a constant burden.

This principle of compounding drugs, and as some of your formulas show, the use of from four to seventy-two different remedies, necessarily increases the size of the dose to such a degree that it not only becomes sickening to the system, and destructive to the health, but actually produces death in thousands of instances, showing conclusively that you are wholly in ignorance what remedy to prescribe to meet the condition of the diseased system.

Such prescriptions remind us forcibly of a man shooting at



a squirrel, and knowing himself to be a poor marksman, loads his gun with fine shot, coarse shot, little balls, big balls, square shot, and slugs. "Now," says he, "that squirrel is sure to come. The load will scatter, so I'll just point my gun into the tree top, shut my eyes, and bang away." Had he been a good marksman, a small ball would have done just as well. So with your Allopathic prescriptions; you prepare those massive doses of compounds, empirically chosen, then shut your eyes to consequences, hold the nose of your patient and gag it down him in the hope that it will scatter and kill the disease. One thing is certain, you generally succeed in crippling the patient for life, and often miss the disease and kill the patient.

From the foregoing short illustration you are prepared for the announcement that, under the guidance of the

### HOMEOPATHIC LAW,

We utterly and totally reject the maxim of Galen, which recommends the use of contra-irritants and depleting measures, adhering firmly to the one adopted by our great leader, Hahnemann, of *Similia Similibus Curantur*, or that "Like will cure its like."

To accomplish cures upon this principle, we reject the Allopathic theory of prescribing remedies in compounded or massive doses not only on the ground that they are injurious to the system, but also that disease is cured by secondary, and not by the primary action of remedies. Therefore, when Homeopathy is correctly interpreted, it teaches—

First, that "Like will cure its like."

Second, "That to accomplish a speedy and effectual cure of any disease, remedies must be exhibited in small, and sometimes, infinitesimal doses."

Third, "That in giving remedies on the principles of

Homeopathy, we act upon the diseased part upon the law of specific action of medicine; by which we mean that every remedy used in our practice, if given in strict accordance with the law of similitude as demonstrated by our provings, becomes a specific for the cure of 'its like;' *i. e.*, it will cure symptoms similar to those it would produce if given in poisonous doses.

Fourth, "that inasmuch as our remedies are given upon a law of specific, and that as their action can be calculated with almost mathematical certainty, it abrogates the necessity of inflaming healthy parts of the system, debilitating or disturbing any other organ or tissue. Hence the sufferings always following Allopathic medication are avoided."

Fifth. "The doctrine of Homeopathy also teaches that no two diseases of a contra nature, or kinds of inflammation, can exist in the same organ at the same time; for where two existing causes act upon the same part, the one possessing the most powerful action must necessarily banish and supersede the weaker. Therefore, in accordance with the rules of our system, remedies act or impress directly the organ or tissue diseased, which by a superior force abolishes the disease and usurps temporarily the control of the organs; then by discontinuing the remedy the artificial disease terminates, and the natural disease is cured."

Sixth. "That the organ or tissue when diseased has less power to resist the force and action of remedies than in health. Therefore, in the Homeopathic principles of medication remedies are expected to spend their force directly on those parts which are actually diseased," and for this reason we are not under the necessity of exhibiting those crude drugs and massive doses so often prescribed in Allopathic practice.

Seventh. Homeopathy employs only those medicines which have been repeatedly proven on the healthy system. By carefully preserving these for future reference, they become the key which unlocks the great storehouse of the *Materia Medica*, and enables the practitioner to select the required and appropriate remedy to cure like or corresponding symptoms. Therefore the Homeopathist seeks and prescribes for symptoms actually existing in his patient, and for none other.

Let us as briefly as possible review these principles, and see if they are possessed of any real merit.

First: Will like cure like? or, is there any proof that this is the law of cure?

In disease there is nothing to cure but the sufferings of the patient, and these are made manifest through the symptoms produced by the disease. Hahnemann expresses himself thus: "Beyond the totality of the symptoms, there is nothing discoverable in disease by which they could make known the nature of the medicine they stand in need of, and we ought therefore to conclude naturally that there can be no other indication whatever than the ensemble of the symptoms in each individual case to guide us in the selection of a remedy."

These are the views entertained by our school. *The totality of the symptoms* are to be sought, as well as the causes which lead to their expression. It is not enough that the physician gather a few of the more important symptoms, and allow the minor ones to pass unnoticed.

Having carefully studied these, the next inquiry arises, what remedy in the *Materia Medica* is best calculated to impress the system with "their like," and if found, will this "like to like" cure?

The future can only be judged by the past. If the testimony of a hundred, a thousand, or ten thousand persons all corroborate the occurrence of any past event—no matter what, it is good authority that when a like condition of things shall again exist, like results will follow. Upon this hypothesis, let us introduce the testimony of Homeopaths in relation to this law. Suppose we have a patient very sick; for convenience we will represent his symptoms by the alphabet, a, b, c, and from that to x, y, z, inclusive. The doctor turns to his *Materia Medica*, carefully analyzing the symptoms, and he finds that aconite and nux-vomica, for example, have produced in the healthy systems of a hundred of our provers, symptoms corresponding to those of his patient, or, if you please, those represented by a, b, c, and from that to x, y, z. Acting upon his belief that “like will cure like,” he prescribes those remedies in minute doses, and in a few hours his patient is well. On consulting authors, and in hearing the testimony of the profession, he finds the same happy effects have been produced by each one in hundreds of cases. Then from the testimony of the past, the experience of the profession, and the satisfaction manifested in the expressions of countless thousands of our patients, we can rely with implicit confidence in our law of cure, and that where we find any given number of symptoms present in any case, the remedy that has been proven on the healthy organism and found capable of producing a like or corresponding disease, is the required remedy. This is our *modus operandi* of proving drugs and selecting remedies when prescribing.

Such has been the satisfaction derived from the administration of remedies upon the principles that “like will cure like,” that some Homeopathic authors have adopted the name of “specific remedy,” “Homeopathic specifics.” We

have no personal objection to this phraseology, should have less if the idiopathic and symptomatic symptoms could readily be distinguished by the practitioner. In fact, when any remedy and disease resemble each other in their idiopathic symptoms, then the remedy will actually become a specific. This connection between symptoms and disease can only be found in the Homeopathic principles of carefully analyzing the symptoms of both disease and proven remedies. To be strictly a Homeopathic specific, the relation of the remedy to the diseased organ in general, as well as the peculiar pathological state of the diseased organ for which the remedy is prescribed, must be clearly understood. As these may be materially modified by the individuality of the patient, or his peculiar temperament, which will also modify the action of the remedy, we think the impression that Homeopathic remedies are specifics ought to be more sparingly used. For there is no disease which is so universal in its character that one and the same remedy can be appropriated at all times and under any circumstances for its cure. Therefore, in any given disease we lay down a variety of remedies whose symptoms may be found by referring to the *Materia Medica*, and the toxical effects and provings produced on various individuals. From these symptoms, by comparing them with those of the patient we must judge what are the appropriate remedies, or that like for which like it is designed to cure.

As before remarked, care must be taken and much judgment used in gathering the totality of the symptoms, or the prescription may fail to do what we expect. To illustrate: If we had a case of nausea with eructations and bitter vomiting, or an accumulation of saliva in the mouth during the nausea, and vomiting of the ingesta, ipecacuanha is the appropriate remedy because in poisonous doses it will produce



these symptoms. But if, instead of those symptoms, there is violent pain in the stomach, internal burning, heat, intense thirst, dryness of the mouth and throat, soreness and tenderness of the stomach on pressure, we would fail to produce a cure with ipecacuanha, as these are not the symptoms of that remedy, but those of arsenicum; therefore this is the remedy, because in poisonous doses it produces those or their like symptoms, and in Homeopathic doses it will cure. The same course must be followed in the selection of any remedy. If the symptoms present are mostly referable to the stomach, and the nausea and vomiting is accompanied by a different train of symptoms, as for example, those produced by poisonous doses of tartar emetic, then the exhibition of infinitely small particles of the same remedy as prescribed by the Homeopathist will cure. The same may be said of lobelia inflata, tabacum, etc.

This is our law of like to cure like. No, not our law, but God's, as revealed to man by the immortal Hahnemann.

To return to the original question :

#### WILL THIS LAW OF LIKE SYMPTOM CURE ?

We may as well unfold the whole book of nature to prove an axiom, *e. g.*, "the sun shines," or that "plants grow," as to prove what can be attested and is acknowledged by countless millions. As the writers of your own school have ceased their tirade upon this part of our principles, it will be necessary to give only a passing remark on this point, and if among the rubbish that surrounds you as an Allopathist, you doubt the validity of this law, a few carefully selected remedies will solve the mystery, clear the fog and mist from your eyes, banish all doubts from your mind as to what law you will in future be guided in selecting and administering your remedies.

To illustrate more forcibly the truth and consistency of this law of similitude, we must again refer to the Allopathic law of contrariis.

The experience of every person who has taken a dose of medicine of sufficient strength to produce any toxical effect, is that a direct train of symptoms, aches or pains following their administration. These symptoms are called the pathological or pathogenetic effects of the remedy. Experience teaches us that after a short time a reaction takes place in the system against the primary action of the drug, the very opposite to what are at first experienced. These are called the secondary effects of the remedy. This is not only the case with one, but nearly all the remedies in use. The Allopathist seeks to cure disease by the primary or contra symptoms produced by the remedy; the Homeopathist by the secondary, or those symptoms similar to the disease.

Suppose we have a case of constipation. The Allopathic method of treatment will be to open the bowels with mild purgatives. The primary effect is to produce a relaxed condition during their influence, but the secondary or curative effect must necessarily produce an opposite condition, consequently we have an obstinate state of constipation. For the truth of these remarks we appeal to countless thousands in general, and to every person in particular who has used them for a constipated condition of the bowels. The more you use cathartics the worse you are off. What is true in this case is equally so in all others where medicines are given to cure by the law of contra symptoms.

What is the philosophical deduction following such a course of treatment? Suppose a remedy is given with the avowed expectation of curing a certain disease by a contra disease or effect; it follows, that if the dose of medicine be of sufficient

strength to produce the desired results, the symptoms of the original disease are covered up, or for the time suspended. But we ask, are they cured? Nay, verily. The primary action being contra to the disease has only gained temporary ascendancy over the diseased organ. But mark you, the secondary action of the remedy now follows, and the symptoms corresponding to the natural disease increase, and as the legitimate result the patient is made radically worse by this aggravation of the original complaint.

If giving cathartics to cure constipation upon the principles of Allopathy were the only evils in your practice, we might not have referred to it in this connection. But it should be impressed indelibly upon your memory that this effect follows in the administration of nearly every remedy given upon the Allopathic theory. The opposite effects always make their appearance with the renewal of the disease, and generally in an aggravated form. As for illustration, purgatives are always followed by constipation, astringents by looseness of the bowels, stimulants by depression, narcotics by restlessness, and so on, *ad infinitum*. It must therefore follow that the action of remedies sought upon this law of cure is only palliative, and by their use in the long run they aggravate the complaint, augment the suffering, exhaust the vital powers, lay the foundation for the development of other acute or chronic diseases, and a premature death.

You know this to be the result that has followed Allopathic practice for two thousand years.

Are we correct? Let millions answer.

As we shall have occasion to refer more particularly to the primary and secondary effect of medicine in another place, we omit further allusion to it here. It was necessary to refer to the law of contra symptoms claimed as curative by the

Allopathists, to more forcibly introduce those of Homeopathy or similitude.

The more common illustrations of this principle in the treatment of disease may be found in cases of freezing, and the application of snow and ice to the frozen parts. We would consider the person insane who would immerse a frozen limb in a pail of hot water. A man over-heated would not be so presumptuous as to drink copious draughts of ice-water, but on the contrary, he would take a swallow of brandy, because in overdraughts it will produce a train of symptoms similar to those induced by overheating. If you burn the hand, you would not plunge it into a pail of ice-water, but hold it a short distance from the fire to "draw the heat out," as is the common expression of every one who is so unfortunate as to require the use of "heat to heat," or "like to cure like." The poor unfortunate inebriate, suffering under the hellish torments of delirium tremens, would hardly be cured by blisters and cathartics, but small doses of alcohol are always given to cure his intolerable anguish and suffering.

The above quotations are from Allopathic authors. Is not this upon the law of "like to cure like?" The every day occurrence of vaccination is another example of this universal law. It may be argued that this is only a prophylactic, or preventive to disease. It is nevertheless upon the law of similitude, or like to like, and the experience of all physicians who have used varioline testifies that it greatly mitigates the symptoms, and in many cases the patient is hardly left with a pustular scar. Ipecacuanha and tartar emetic are used in minute doses by all schools of medicine to cure sickness of the stomach; mercury for the cure of sore mouths, excessive drooling, or ptyalism, and syphilitic affections; copaivæ, cubebæ, and cantharides, for affections of the kidneys; because

in massive doses these are the organs most susceptible to their influence—in minute doses they cure the like symptoms. But as our object is not to prove our position, but simply to illustrate the law of cure as held by our school, we will briefly consider the second proposition, viz :

THE CURATIVE POWER OF DRUGS IS SECURED  
IN THE SECONDARY, INSTEAD OF THE PRIM-  
ITIVE ACTION.

We have briefly referred to this subject in another place. We shall therefore only make such remarks as are designed to illustrate the views held by the Homeopathist in relation to the primitive and secondary action of drugs.

We claim that there is but one true law of cure, derived from the action of remedies.

Allopathic views are wrong if Homeopathic principles are right, and *vice versa*. The Allopathists claim that drugs cure by their primitive force, and Homeopathists claim that the curative power of the remedy should be sought in the secondary action, derived from a re-action of the system against disease.

To obtain the primary action, the old school have to administer their medicine in crude form, and in large doses, because in so doing they seek to cure by the law of contraries.

The Homeopathist discards this law, and seeks to cure disease by the secondary effects of the remedy. The result is, he is compelled to use very small doses. As he selects his remedy upon the law of "like to cure like," he would produce too great an aggravation of the symptoms were he to do otherwise.

Nevertheless a slight aggravation of the symptoms is an indication that the remedy used is Homeopathic, or curative to the disease; *i. e.*, that this slight aggravation of the symp-



toms is an indication that we have administered a remedy which produces *similar* symptoms, hence it acts Homeopathically, or according to the law of "like to cure like."

Therefore the Homeopathist always attacks the disease itself, by producing with his remedies such impressions upon the disordered structure as shall annihilate the original morbid action, and substitute in its stead a temporary drug action, which the recuperative force of the system always speedily removes if the malady be curable.

The Homeopathist gains his knowledge of the action of drugs, not only from their accidental poisonous effects, but by experimenting with remedies upon the healthy system. Carefully recording the symptoms produced, he is able to judge with mathematical certainty that the disease, irritation, inflammation, mental emotion or nervousness following the action of any drug, will cure a like and corresponding set of symptoms when he gives this remedy to get the secondary effect upon the disordered structure.

As disease is not a ponderable substance, but subtle, imponderable, and in many cases absolutely immaterial, like sudden news, anger, grief, fright, or other mental emotion, he does not have to attack it with gross material or ponderable agents, but selects his minute and infinitesimal dose, but yet sufficiently large to aggravate a primitive effect, hardly, and in many cases it may be wholly imperceptible, yet he expects that the curative power, by a re-action of the system against the disease, derived from the secondary action of the remedy, will restore the patient to health.

We do not, however, consider it essential to the recovery of the patient to produce a perceptible primary action of the remedy. But, such is the susceptibility of the system when diseased or inflamed, that we seriously doubt whether a reme-

edy which is correctly chosen according to the true principles of Hhomeopathy, can be exhibited in doses so small that an aggravation of the symptoms will not be more or less perceptible to the patient, although it may not to the physician. Since we have been writing this volume we have had a case of synovitis, where the symptoms present pointed strongly to the use of *rhus toxicodendron*. We prescribed five drops of the third decimal attenuation in two oz. of water, and was forced to antidote the remedy or amount of the increased aggravation of the symptoms. The twentieth centesimal was used with satisfactory results. We also used four doses of sulphur, tenth decimal attenuation, once in eight days, and in each instance saw the lady reduced to extreme suffering and prostration. The lady had never seen the provings of sulphur, and knew nothing of its effects, but to us there was no mistaking the symptoms, the case was too plain. When we assured her that the sufferings she had experienced for four successive weeks was the result of a single dose of the remedy, she remarked that "if such was its effects she wanted no more sulphur in this world, or the next." If we were in the insurance business we would guarantee her safe from all danger in the future world for a very small premium. These two cases both occurred in this city, by giving remedies upon the Hhomeopathic law. Are such results to be disregarded, or will you deny them and cry "humbug?"

The principle adopted by the Hhomeopathist in experimenting with drugs on the healthy person has enabled him to know with positive certainty, what organs and tissues are susceptible to impressions with any given remedy.

He has also learned that when any organ is diseased and suffering from any given number of symptoms, if he selects a proven remedy that has produced like sufferings, and gives

that in any other than minute doses, he will greatly augment the sufferings of his patient, and make them radically worse. Marcy has given us several simple illustrations upon this point. He says: "By experimenting with drugs in health, the Homeopathist knows precisely upon what structures they act specifically, and what symptoms they produce. He knows that disease, irritation, inflammation and nervous ex-thism, render the tissue affected morbidly sensitive to impressions of all kinds, so that things which were salubrious and agreeable in health, become sources of the most exquisite pain, and often actually intolerable. He knows that if brandy or meat, or condiments be introduced into the stomach, the life of the patient is endangered. He knows if he exposes a patient with opthalmia to the bright sunlight, that disorganization and loss of sight will be likely to ensue. In a word, he knows that nearly all diseases render the parts affected so extremely susceptible to impressions of every kind, that the infinitesimal doses of specific medicines produce manifest primitive effects, and therefore if he administer his remedies in a crude form, or Allopathic doses, he is almost sure to produce too violent effects in the form of medicinal aggravations, like those which Hahnemann first observed from the use of ordinary doses of crude drugs. From necessity, therefore, and not from theory, the believers in Homeopathy use small doses in order to avoid the most serious medicinal action. In regard to the dose, one rule prevails among all judicious Homeopathists, viz: to give a sufficient quantity of the drug to cure the disease, with as little detriment to the healthy parts and the general system as possible. The Homeopathist has medicines of every grade of strength, from the mother tinctures and alkaloids to the highest dilutions; but as he has to deal with morbid conditions, totally

different from those in health, and with inflamed tissues so refined in sensibility that light noises, or even mental emotion, become powerful disturbing agents, he finds it necessary from experience to adapt the size of his dose to the altered sensibility of the disordered part, that he may avoid unnecessary active influences. Experience has demonstrated to the satisfaction of every Homeopathist, that all evil effects resulting from the administration of remedies is obviated by our principles of medicating the system.

Here, then, is a marked difference in the two schools of medicine. The Homeopathist, seeking the only curative power that can be found in medicines, administers them in minute doses upon the principle of similitude, derived from the secondary action of the drug. Whereas the Allopathist, with his empirical, contradictory and pernicious notions, chooses to combat disease, an imponderable substance, with ponderable agents, and inflaming healthy parts by filling the system with large quantities of deleterious drugs of which they know nothing with certainty, *and which they never presume to take themselves, when sick.* We can only say, God help the poor victimized Allopathic patient!

Acting upon the belief that in health the system resists with a much greater power the action of remedies, than under the disease, the Homeopathist studies the symptoms produced by large doses of medicine when administered in health. These he would consider the pathogenetic or curative symptoms to be sought through the secondary and not the primary action of the drug. "Thus, the primary operation of stimulants gives rise to an exaltation of the mental and physical powers, whilst a corresponding depression and abasement invariably results as a secondary consequence."

"The primary operation of digitalis in large doses is to re-

tard the action of the heart and arteries. When the system reacts against the remedy, the secondary effect is an augmentation of this action."

"The primary symptoms of aconite are increased action of the circulating vessels; the secondary consequences are a reduction of the pulsations, in some instances as low as thirty-five in a minute. Hence its important use in fever.

"The primary effects of intense cold are to stimulate and invigorate the whole system. The secondary results are a loss of muscular and mental energy, stupor, and death."

"The primary effects of wine are to stimulate and heat the body. The secondary effect is to leave heaviness, drowsiness, and stupor."

"The primary effects of purgatives are to increase the action of the bowels. The secondary effect following is constipation."

"The primary effect of opium is to produce constipation. Its secondary effect is to purge the bowels."

A few very brief remarks upon the

#### NATURE OF DISEASE,

May not be out of place in this connection, as it will help you to understand why the use of Allopathic doses is wholly unnecessary, as well as contrary to nature and all philosophical principles of treating diseases, and why Homeopathy has the ascendancy in the minds of the more refined, intelligent and thinking portion of the community.

True, the teachings of Homeopathy are only in their infancy. The developments of science will doubtless remove much that is now hid in obscurity, and reveal new beauties as, step by step, she unveils the hidden wisdom of God in those natural laws which govern the healing art. Each step she has taken forward in the science of medicine, has reflect-



ed more clearly the dogmas and barbarities of the orthodox school on the one hand, and the mercy, beauty and superiority of the reform system on the other, and will, until the last pain is felt, and the last wail of woe following the use of your system of torture shall go forth upon the great ocean of eternity, to be remembered by Him who has said, "blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

This work of mercy is what the Homeopathist is laboring to accomplish. It is the alpha and omega of those principles which must follow our practice upon the law of similitude. Its truths set aside the hundred and one different theories propagated and held by the Allopathic profession in relation to the nature of disease, and the remedies or means used to eradicate it from the system.

The same routine of cathartics, emetics, blisters, cupping-glass and lancet advocated twenty-two hundred years ago, is boldly, fearlessly, and we may add, shamelessly upheld by them at the present day. But the Homeopathist objects to assailing a poor suffering patient as they would a robber or midnight assassin—with a shower of deathly missiles. We do not expect to expel by force of arm a hydra-headed monster, a masked image, of physical, tangible form or shape. But not so with your views about the nature of disease and the means you would use to eradicate it from the system. Deathly missiles must be used; instruments of torture are applied thick and fast; boluses of poison are crammed by force into the stomach of your patient. The license being granted, the edict goes forth: "Spare not!" "Slay the monster disease! Expel him by force from the system!"

For what purpose, let us ask, has this battle array been instituted? Merely to eradicate an invisible, immaterial and imponderable agent (disease) from the system.

But have you succeeded? In the long years of King Allopathy's reign, have you ever expelled a "monster" in the form of disease from the system of one of your patients? Have you ever found him in the vessel, after the most pungent cathartics or powerful emetics? Have you ever drawn him out through the veins by the use of the lancet, or through the skin by setons, blisters, cupping-glasses, or antimonial ointments? We think not. At least, none of the *clique* have ever exhibited him for ocular inspection. We therefore think that twenty centuries' experience in that practice would lead the people to adopt a more rational view, and, in the room of looking upon disease as a ponderable substance, to be forcibly expelled by ponderable and deathly agents, they should look upon it as merely a disturbance of the life force, consequent upon the existence of some minute, imperceptible, infinitesimal molecules of miasmeta circulating in the system, causing a loss of balance between the life forces, or the electrical current.

The views entertained by electricians possess some degree of plausibility, and their method of treating disease shows that they are correct as far as the use of electricity as a therapeutic agent is concerned.

They hold that there is but one general cause for all disease, and that is, a loss of balance between the positive and negative forces of the system. These forces they term positive and negative electricity, hence they divide all diseases into two orders only. They call all inflammatory actions positive disease, and treat them with negative electricity, and all negative diseases, such as paralysis, indolent ulcers, tremors, fits, cancers, &c., they treat with positive electricity. We neither speak for or against this theory. We allude to it for the purpose of illustrating the impropriety of combatting in-

visible, inponderable, infinitesimal molecules hid in the different organs or tissues, ultimating in disease, with gross, crude remedies in Allopathic doses, or other appliances so harsh and inhuman in their nature. That unfortunate lady who has just received a letter containing the sad intelligence of the death of a beloved husband, gives expression to the deep emotions of her soul by sighs and tears; this is followed by nervous sympathy and hysterics for several days. One hour before she was in health and hilarity of spirits. Now she is in convulsions frightful to behold. Would it be good sense to suppose some hidden monster has suddenly entered her system, and that to expunge it, she must be assailed with a host of deadly missiles? Yet it would be just as reasonable to attempt forcibly to expel by cathartics, emetics, or other depleting measures this mental derangement, as to forcibly assail the system for the purpose of eradicating the molecules causing measles, malaria, colds and fever, either remittent or intermittent. One possesses just as much form, size, weight and measurement as the other. Neither cause producing the effect can be seen or chemically analyzed. Both are the results of some disturbance in the human organization, wholly imponderable, unseen, and incapable of demonstration. The natural law which controlled the healthy action has become forcibly changed by some unexpected and disturbing cause. The nervous fluid which was being freely distributed to every part of the system, has suddenly become arrested, the balance between the positive and negative forces is broken up, too much is retained in one part, whilst a corresponding want is felt in some other part. This want of equilibrium in the vital forces produces disease. The views entertained by Hahnemann are somewhat different from those advanced by the electrical school, yet they approximate towards each other.

He says: "In health the vital force which dynamically animates the material body exercises an unlimited power. It preserves every part of the organism in an admiral vital harmony, as regards sensation and action, so that the spirit which resides within us, and which is endowed with reason, is able to freely employ those living and healthy instruments for the purpose of accomplishing the high end of our existence." He also adds that "this spiritual force, which is active in itself and universally present in the body, is the only one which at first preserves the dynamic influence of the agent hostile to life. Having been disturbed by this perception, this force becomes capable of communicating to the organism the disagreeable sensation which is experienced, and of driving it to those usual actions we call disease."

From the above quotations, it is evident that the views entertained by Hahnemann and those of electricians approximate very near to each other. The former attributes disease to the manifest impressions received by the spirit or life principle of man, and the latter to the disturbance of the electrical force, which is manifest in the phenomena of disease. What the former calls the vital spirit principle the latter calls the *nervo-vital* force of man.

Among the many theories that have been introduced by the medical profession, these to us are the most plausible. We also think the most satisfactory explanations can be brought to bear upon the pathogenetic action of remedies by adopting these views. Those of Hahnemann would embrace all diseases, as well as those arising from mental emotion, such as great joy, excessive grief, fear, anger, jealousy, etc., and those of the electrician such diseases as arise from mechanical injuries, or any cause which may produce a disturbance in the circulation, or *nervo-vital* force.

We have before remarked that disease is a tangible material substance capable of demonstration or it is not.

That which is capable of demonstration must have form, size, weight, dimension, or be capable of chemical analysis.

But disease has neither form, size, weight, dimension, nor can be chemically analyzed, therefore disease is not a tangible substance.

If disease is not a gross, ponderable, material substance, it must be an imponderable and immaterial substance. If it is imponderable and immaterial are not the views here introduced as good, if not better than any other ever promulgated? We think so, and as such will hold good until you prove their fallacy.

Allowing this hypothesis to be true, it follows that remedies must act either

- 1st, Mechanically,
- 2d, Chemically, or
- 3d, Dynamically.

In the treatment of disease the Homeopathist prepares his remedies with a view of bringing out this dynamic force, a principle wholly rejected by the Allopathist.

Hahnemann claims that one dynamic force must be modified by another dynamic force, and *vice versa*, and as proof of this theory he quotes the dynamic character of those diseases which result from pure mental emotion, which are evidently immaterial causes of disease. If, then, disease is the result of immaterial causes, and these causes are manifest in all the vast train of symptoms presented through this immaterial influence, why not meet it by a force immaterial or dynamical, which we claim can be found in our remedies.

### MECHANICAL ACTION OF REMEDIES.

To meet the symptoms present in this immaterial cause of



disease, you, as an Allopathist, would have to prescribe your remedies mechanically, or chemically. In administering your drugs mechanically, you may apply them to the surface of the body or introduce them into the stomach or any other natural passage, but in doing so you must subject them to the same laws that govern the action of any inert substance placed under a similar situation, *i. e.*, you must reduce them to size, density, weight, and shape, to gain the power sought by this mechanical force; in no other way can you gain this mechanical action. Therefore, to cure disease by this principle, drugs are employed in their crude form and in massive doses. This mechanical force is your boasted theory of contra irritation. In the proper place we shall show that this mechanical action of remedies is not a curative agent under the law claimed by Allopathic writers.

A passing remark in relation to the

#### CHEMICAL ACTION OF DRUGS,

May also be introduced here, as you often boast that Homeopaths are forced to the use of Allopathic principles in curing disease. True, we do not claim the chemical action of drugs to be the dynamic force sought upon the teachings of Hahnemann. Neither can the chemical action of drugs be claimed under the law of contrariis. It is simply that action which consists in a "chemical reaction which they exercise on the material element of the organism with which they are brought in contact," or, in other words, "the chemical action of drugs consists in their atomic displacement and transformation or combination which takes place between the molecules of the material drug and those of the living tissues, or of those tissues which the chemical agent has succeeded by its presence in depriving of their vitality, and decomposing them." Is this Allopathy, or is it the science of chemistry,

which should be used by all schools of medicine, as the case may require?

The Homeopathist, therefore, does not attempt to cure disease by the use of remedies only from the power derived from their dynamic force, according to the law of similitude. He also has equal rights with all schools to use remedies mechanically and chemically, without any violation of his avowed principles. The disturbance he finds in the organism, manifested through the "spirit principle" of Hahnemann, or the "nervo-vital fluid" of the electrician, presented through symptoms, he claims to be correct by the law that "one dynamic force must be regulated by another dynamic force," or *vice versa*. Therefore he only seeks to bring about a natural and healthy reaction of the system against disease by the administration of small, and in most cases, infinitesimal particles of such remedies as, by his provings and according to his therapeutic law, will produce the required effects; which we get from the secondary in the room of the primary action of remedies.

We referred to the theory of disease, and the mechanical, chemical, and dynamic action of drugs in this place, to more forcibly illustrate the propriety of our principles of medication. In its appropriate place we will refer to it again.

In our third proposition we claim that,  
TO SECURE A SPEEDY AND EFFECTUAL CURE  
OF ANY DISEASE, REMEDIES MUST BE EX-  
HIBITED IN SMALL, AND IN MOST CASES, IN-  
FINITESIMAL DOSES.

This is the great obstacle in the way of our success. It is the bar placed between us and hundreds of families who otherwise would gladly embrace our doctrine. "How is it possible," say those unacquainted with our principles, "that these

minute doses can do any good?" You, knowing this to be the weak point, the stumbling block in the way of our triumphant victory, take every occasion to prejudice the people on this point, misrepresenting everything in this respect possible for the powers of your imagination to suggest. At it has been pointed puny argument and keen satire, and although they have always rebounded upon themselves, nevertheless, this misrepresentation alone keeps up a practice for the time being, which otherwise would perish and crumble o'er the graves of his slain millions.

You must bear in mind that there are two sides to this question. How many years you have represented the one, we know not, and care less. Since our arrival here we can give you, as well as some others, the credit of laying yourselves out pretty effectually upon the size of a Homeopathic dose. Your misrepresentations on this subject caused the publication of one of our lectures. The limited space we were compelled to occupy admitted only a brief reference to it. We will, therefore, have to call your attention to a few facts by which we hope effectually to remove this stumbling block from our road and the minds of the people.

Whether you have been honest in your opinion, and supposed you were quoting truthful arguments, drawn from Drs. Simpson, Hooker, Palmer, Forbes, Merel, Jason, Dodge, Clark, and others, is not for us to say. This, however, we have a right to assert: If you supposed you were using arguments unanswered, you labored under a grand mistake. If, also, you supposed these arguments were true, you displayed a greater amount of ignorance in relation to the principles of Homeopathy than we had supposed.

It appears that all Allopathists who love preconceived theories more than the investigation of truth, have a peculiar in-

distinctive wag of the tongue in falsifying the size of the Homeopathic dose. Unfortunately for your school, some of your authors and writers have exposed themselves to the severest criticism from our authors, by stepping aside from the legitimate study of the profession, turning mathematicians, and attempting to figure out the size of a Homeopathic prescription.

Whether you used your own mathematical genius and figured according to Daboll, when you discovered that "a Homeopathic dose means to put a drop of medicine in Lake Michigan, and give a teaspoonful once a week," which is so often quoted to your patients, or whether you calculated to quote from Profs. Forbes, Palmer, Simpson, and Hooker, is not for us to decide.

One thing, however, we are justifiable in saying, and that is, when you, or any other person, use such arguments against Homeopathy, you utter sentiments as foreign from truth as hell is from heaven. When used in a spirit of sarcasm we can appreciate the joke and good naturedly pass it by. But when the stars of your profession, the Pleiades around which cluster a host of admirers, will, over their own signatures, utter falsehoods of such magnitude as to exhaust the numerical value of figures, for the purpose of placing a false argument into the hands of those who worship at their shrine, because they know it will be used by them as it has been by you, viz: to misrepresent us, and, as far as possible, to sustain a practice destitute of merit or principle, we can only say, good Lord, what won't they do next?

You, as well as every other Allopathist, know that the principles upon which you predicate your practice are overthrown. And upon every point that you have assailed the teachings of the reform school, you are fairly and honorably

silenced, yet you persistently press this one theme upon the minds of your supporters, in order to make them believe "it's all wind," "a bag of gas," "an empty bubble which will soon explode."

You doubtless remember the fable of the ox and toad. It appears master toad, becoming jealous of his rights, made use of some pretty tall Allopathic arguments by calling the ox a bag of wind and gas, and said he had no right to drink from the pond where his royal toadship rode on a chip at ease. The ox thought differently from master toad, and concluded he occupied full as much right on terra firma as the conceited toad, and was quite as useful to the world. The toad, in order to make the best of a poor argument, concluded to turn a bag of wind himself. So he began to gather in air, and increased in size until from weakness he bursted, and spilt himself over. Precisely so with you, my dear doctor, in your efforts to prove a false position about Homeopathic doses, you have come out as did the toad.

Let us see how hard the learned John Forbes, M. D., F. R. S., labored to prove the position you have assumed. From his example take warning, and don't throw figures in by the handful, for they mean something, and when properly arranged won't lie.

In his letter addressed to Young Physicians, (meaning those of the regular puking school,) he says, when speaking upon the size of a Homeopathic prescription: "So minute are the doses prescribed by the Hahnemannian school, that they are scarcely conceivable by the human mind. They defy all the powers of the chemist and physician to detect in them any trace of the remedial substance which they profess to contain, and they almost confound arithmetic in reckoning their amount. We are not ashamed to confess that our own



powers are inadequate to put down in figures an ordinary Homeopathic dose, and we suspect that many of the Homeopaths would find themselves in the same predicament on trial." In speaking of these minute doses, he adds: "The hundredth part of a grain is intelligible enough, the ten thousandth (10,000) is comprehensible, but begins to waver before the mental view, while the millionth (1,000,000) part of a grain puts our powers of comprehension on the rack and leaves us in a chaos of undefined entities, or non-entities, we know not which. We fancy that we grasp the reality, and then in an instant it vanishes like a phantom, even beyond the sphere of imagination itself. Having got so far, the additional subdivisions or attenuations scarcely add to our difficulties. The mind in such cases is occupied by a word more than a thing, and whether the word be a million, billion, or decillion, the power of comprehension seems the same." After exhausting his mathematical genius, bewildered, reeling and fainting, the great Doctor seats himself, and after a long breath, a cough and a sneeze, reveals to the world the size of a Homeopathic dose, which he represented by 1,000000,-000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,000000,-000000,000000,000000. At this point it appears the learned professor gave out. The powers of his mathematical calculation having become exhausted, he quotes from Dr. Alexander Wood's "very clever pamphlet," who has also laid us "poor deluded set" on the shelf by sending the Homeopathic phantom into nonentity. He says: "No language can give even the slightest idea, and though calculations may express it in figures, yet they fail to convey any mental conception of the amount." He, however, was bound to give our dose a hack, and accordingly gave the following analogical illustration, as tending at least, as Dr. Forbes remarked, "to help us com-



[illegible]

Whew !!

The learned Professor of Pathology in the University of Michigan having a good supply of sugar on hand, seems at a loss what to do with it, goes into the liquor business rather more extensively than Pike, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Being an expert in the business, he soon comes to the following conclusion: "For the first dilution 100 drops of alcohol would be used; for the second 100 times as many, which would be 10,000 drops, or as ascertained, about one pint; for the third, 100 pints; the fourth, 10,000,000." He now gets along bravely, for, says he, "It now mounts up rapidly at each dilution. For the ninth dilution it would require 10,000,000,000 of gallons, which is found by computation to be equal to the water in a lake twelve miles in circumference. For three dilutions more, the twelfth, it requires a million of such lakes, which, according to computation, would equal five hundred lakes as large as Lake Superior. The fifteenth dilution would require a body of fluid sixty-one times greater than the earth, and for the thirtieth it would actually take a quantity of fluid exceeding the volume of a quadrillion of suns."

Here the learned Professor of the University of Michigan collapses, but after the application of ammonia by G. W. Snyder, friction and counter-irritants along the spine by F. A. Spalding, and a little blood-letting by C. B. Cody, committee of a class of young "regulars," who solicited in be-

half of the puke and purgative students of said university a copy of said lecture for publication, he goes on with other and more minute calculations. To make sure of annihilating Homeopathy this time he calls to his aid the mathematical calculation of Sir James Simpson, of the University of Edinburgh. They also summon to their assistance the Professor of Mathematics of the same noted Institution, and enter the observatory, pen, telescope and astronomical apparatus at hand, take a peep at Neptune, the Pleiades, the Mediterranean Sea, an ocean of alcohol, a snifter, then proceed to the following calculation, which we give you, *verbatim et literatim* :

- 1st Attenuation.—One grain, or drop, in one and a half tea-spoonfuls of alcohol.
- 2d Attenuation.—One grain, in twenty-one fluid ounces of alcohol.
- 3d Attenuation.—One grain, in two thousand and eighty ounces; or in one hundred and four pints of alcohol.
- 6th Attenuation.—One grain, in thirteen million gallons; or in two hundred and six thousand hogsheads; or in fifty-one thousand tons of alcohol.
- 9th Attenuation.—One grain, in a lake of alcohol with a volume of about fourteen cubic miles; or in a lake fifty fathoms in depth, and presenting two hundred and fifty miles of square surface.
- 12th Attenuation.—One grain, in a sea containing about fourteen million cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity of fluid equal to a sea six times the size of the Mediterranean Sea.
- 15th Attenuation.—One grain, in an ocean of fourteen billion cubic miles of alcohol; or in an ocean about forty-six thousand times greater than the whole waters contained in all the oceans of the earth.
- 24th Attenuation.—One grain, in an ocean of fourteen quintillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty masses, each filling a sphere extending from limit to limit of the orbit of the planet Neptune.

30th Attenuation.—One grain, in an ocean of fourteen septillion cubic miles of alcohol; or in a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty billion spherical masses extending from limit to limit of Neptune's orbit; or in a quantity equal to many hundred spheres, each with a semi-diameter or radius extending from the earth to the nearest fixed star.

Now, this 30th dilution, which Hahnemann asserts as indubitably "the best dose" of all drugs for chronic or acute diseases, consists of a duodecillionth of a grain of the drugs used; or, in other words, it consists of a minute globule of sugar, moistened by being simply dipped in a drop out of an ocean of fluid one hundred and forty billions (140,000,000,000) times as large as our whole planetary system, and which enormous ocean has been medicated for the purposes of Homeopathy by having dissolved and mixed through it one single grain of the appropriate drug.

We will close these quotations by another short illustration of Professor Simpson's mathematical calculations upon Homeopathic doses, page 22: "The fifteenth dilution would require a mass of sugar sixty-one times as large as the whole earth. The 16th would require 100 times as much, *i. e.*, 61 multiplied by 100 is 6,100. Multiplying each time by 100 from the 15th to the 30th, fifteen times would make 30 ciphers joined to the 61, making a bulk 61,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 times larger than the earth."

We must now review the quotations, as they are a fair representation of the sentiments uttered by your profession in relation to the size of a Homeopathic prescription. In justice to others we ought to introduce the calculation of Dr. Hooker, but as he has only followed in the wake of Prof. Simpson, we will forbear. We may call him up on some other topic before we get through.

It is a little amusing to follow the calculations of these great mathematicians of Allopathic notoriety, and see how they jump at conclusions for the purpose of falsifying the



plain teachings of our school. As an illustration we refer you to Dr. Alexander Wood's calculation in relation to the number of pellets that would be required to reach from the earth to the sun. He says: "Twenty of the Homeopathic globules measure an inch," and taking this as a basis for his future calculation, he proceeds: "The distance between the earth and sun is ninety-five millions of miles, and one hundred and fifty-eight billions and four hundred millions of these will reach to the sun."

Let us see:

20 times 12 equals 240, the number of pellets in a foot.

240 times  $16\frac{1}{2}$  equals 3,960, the number of pellets in a rod.

3960 times 320 equals 1,267,200, number of pellets in a mile.

1,267,200 times 95,000,000 equals 120,384,000,000,000, the actual number required to reach from earth to sun.

Wood's calculation is 158,400,000,000; an Allopathic error of one hundred and twenty quadrillions, two hundred and twenty-five billions, and six hundred millions of globules.

Upon this small Allopathic error he bases his future calculation upon the "unbounded nothingness" of a Homeopathic dose; soars among the constellations, runs against comets, squares the earth, cubes the sun, flounders in oceans of alcohol, sweetened with quadrillions of Homeopathic globules millions of times larger than will occupy the square of the space between the earth and Neptune, quaffs in eternity, and then tells you that "Homeopaths do actually use the thirtieth attenuation prepared in the sentesimal scale as directed by Hahnemann," and with apparent honesty tries to make the people believe this is a fact in relation to our dose. Is it possible for history to show where man has labored so long and hard to prove a *reducto ad absurdum*? Do they not display the greatest amount of stupidity ever manifested

in thinking men when they maintain that we use the higher potences from the 10th to the 200th, and at the same time labor to show that such a preparation is a thing wholly impossible?

Professor Palmer, on page 18, quoting from Hahnemann's *Organon*, says: "The very smallest,—I repeat it, for it holds good, and will continue to hold good as a Homeopathic therapeutic maxim, not to be refuted by any experience in the world, that the best dose of the properly selected remedy is *always the very smallest* one in the higher dynamizations, (10th to 30th dilution) as well for chronic as acute diseases." He labors very hard to stamp this position upon the frontals of our system, and then brings to his aid all the great reasoners in your ranks to show that no such dose can possibly exist! What reasoning from Professors of Universities?

Prof. Palmer bases his calculation upon a lake twelve miles in circumference. It may be shallow enough for the tall mathematician to catch minnows in, or it may be sixty fathoms in depth—that has very little to do with this close reasoning Allopathic gentleman.

We had supposed that figures would not lie. But, really, any one who can have the patience to sit down and carefully estimate the different statements, will see that the wildest assertions are made, that figures do not agree, that lakes, worlds, suns, planetary systems, and figures, are thrown in at random, and that figures and language are exhausted for the purpose of representing base falsehoods.

It may be wrong for us to treat these gentlemen with such burlesque as expressed in our comments upon their quotations. Neither would we, if they had not known they were trying to make the people believe what is actually false, as we shall presently show, and that they knew every word they

uttered was foreign to the teachings of Hahnemann. Yet they appear to convey the idea of candor, reasoning, and truth.

Acting upon the supposition that he had sealed the fate of all Homeopaths by quoting from our great leader, he adds: "Hahnemann recommended and used the 30th attenuations," mark the expression, used the 30th attenuation, "declaring them the most efficacious," and then, in the very same paragraph, says: "A dose of the 30th dilution consists of a duceillionth of a grain of the drug used; or in other words it consists of a minute globule of sugar moistened by being simply dipped in a drop out of an ocean of fluid one hundred and forty billions (140,000,000,000) of times as large as our whole planetary system, and which enormous ocean has been medicated for the purposes of Homeopathy by having dissolved and mixed through it one single grain of an appropriate drug."

But it appears you have forgotten these arguments, and in your illustration you compare the size of our dose, to putting "a drop of medicine into lake Michigan and giving a teaspoonful once a week," and endeavor with apparent earnestness and honesty to make the people believe this is a part and parcel of Homeopathic principles, or a *fac simile* of our dose. We would be glad to award to you the credit of honesty, and to the writers we have quoted, truth and sincerity. But their own quotations show that they know, as you do, when you make these gross assertions, that every word is foreign to the teachings of Hahnemann or his disciples.

What *are* the facts in relation to the third, tenth, or thirtieth attenuation, or what is our *modus operandi* in preparing the higher dilutions, about which your school is so deeply

interested, and which you so eagerly misrepresent in your mathematical calculations? Simply this:

If we wished to prepare the 30th attenuation on the decimal scale (the one generally in use by our school), we would procure thirty vials of an equal size. Suppose we wanted half an oz.; in these thirty vials we would put thirty half oz. of alcohol, or for convenience of numbers, say 300 drops, numbering them on the corks from 1 to 30. The first contains the mother tincture of Hydrastin; from this vial we put one ninth of its contents, 33 drops, into vial No. 2. This gives the first decimal attenuation. From No. 2 vial we put one ninth of its contents into vial No. 3. This gives us the second decimal attenuation. From this we repeat to the next vial in the same way. So we continue until we have gone through the whole series, from 1 to 30 inclusive, remembering to give each vial a thorough shaking before dropping into the one next in order. Thus the 30th dilution about which so much Allopathic figuring is done, is actually prepared from just 15 oz. of alcohol, and may be as easily prepared from 2 oz., as from 15 or 30. *This is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth*, and every word you or any other person utters, different from this in relation to the size of a Hhomeopathic dose, is a base misrepresentation known to be such by those who relate them.

In proof of this we quote from the 19th page of Professor Palmer's lecture. In quoting from Hahnemann, he says: "If two drops of a mixture of equal parts of alcohol and recent juice of any medicinal plant be diluted with ninety-eight drops of alcohol in a vial capable of containing 130 drops, and the whole shaken together, the medicine becomes exalted in energy to the first development of power, or, as it may be denominated, the first potency. The process is to be con-

tinued through 29 additional vials, each of equal capacity to the first, and each to contain ninety-nine drops of alcohol, so that every successive vial after the first being with one drop from the vial or dilution preceding, which has just been shaken, is in turn to be shaken, remembering to number the dilution of each vial upon the cork as the operation proceeds. These manipulations are to be continued thus through all the vials, from the first to the thirtieth, or decillionth development of power, which is the one in most general use." On the same page he tells us that "the triturations are to be prepared in a mortar in sugar, from the third to the thirtieth or millionth degree, the same process going through 27 different vials." Hahnemann used the sentesimal in the room of the decimal scale. After making use of these quotations, it would seem incredible that he would labor so hard to misrepresent plain language; and yet, upon the very next page he magnifies these thirty vials containing 100 drops each, out of which Hahnemann so plainly describes the way he prepares the 30th attenuation, calling it the decillionth dynamization. Profs. Palmer, Simpson, Forbes, Wood, Hooker, Clark, and others, magnify these 3,000 drops into a globe or "ocean of alcohol one hundred and forty billions (140,000,000,000) of times greater than the spherical mass extending from limit to limit of Neptune's orbit; or in quantity equal to many hundred spheres, each with a semi-diameter or orbit extending from the earth to the nearest fixed star; or a bulk 61,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 times greater than the whole earth."

We will award to the Professor the credit of quoting one passage in his elaborate lecture in full. The rest are garbled quotations, broken fragments and parts of sentences, nicely selected and put together to accomplish his design, viz., to



misrepresent the plain teachings of our school. Judging from the rest of his garbled quotations, we can hardly reconcile the idea of his referring to the 30 vials each containing 100 drops of alcohol, and telling us that from these Hahnemann prepares his decillionth potency, unless he supposed that in the midst of such tall figuring *the small vials would be overlooked*.

When men are driven to extremes to maintain a position, they will resort to any measures, no matter how absurd; therefore we have never read any Allopathic author who has not followed in this same track of garbled quotations, and misconstruing the plain fundamental teachings of Hahnemann. When your authors shall learn to write for the sake of truth, and to enlighten the people in the room of trying to deceive them, another class of productions will flow from their pens. We remember to have seen a quotation from Hahnemann as follows: "The thirtieth potency, or decillionth power of development, is the one most in use." The writer then went on to show what the thirtieth or decillionth development was, by quoting from the 120th page of the *Organon*, where Hahnemann says that "one drop or one grain to 99 drops of alcohol or 99 grains of sugar of milk, and triturated for one hour in a porcelain mortar with a porcelain pestle, and after an hour's trituration we obtain the first trituration. The second trituration is prepared by triturating one grain of the first trituration with an additional 99 grains of sugar of milk." Here the writer left the quotation, carefully omitting "This process is to be continued through all the remaining 27 vials." From this point the Allopathist jumps into geometrical progression, exhausts the powers of mathematics until the "mind wavers," and "fancy is lost in the infinitude of infinite unbounded nothing."

Does Hahnemann say one word from the beginning to the close of his writings to the effect that the quantity of alcohol or sugar of milk is to be increased in geometrical ratio? No, verily! He is very explicit to give the number and size of the vial, and that "each one is only to contain 100 drops of alcohol, or, if sugar of milk, 100 grains, and for convenience of shaking it is better that the vials be capable of holding 130 drops." Adopting the centennial scale he orders one drop of the pure tincture to be put in vial No. 2, well shaken, which gives the first dilution; one drop from vial No. 2 is to be put in vial No. 3 containing one hundred drops of pure alcohol, and this process continued through all the vials.

Yet, after quoting this plain, unmistakable language, the authors above named as well as yourself, falsify plain teachings, exhaust figures and language, in grossly misrepresenting the size of a Homeopathic dose, and actually impress upon the minds of the people that this is a fair and honorable statement of facts, drawn from the writings of our great teacher. It is an old saying that the man who tells the first story has no chance, but in this instance you are beaten by Profs. Simpson, Forbes, Wood, Hooker, and Palmer, for they have exhausted figures so entirely that Forbes complained that "the noughts were all used up," after which he exhausts language in manufacturing a tale wholly destitute of truth; in fact, the learned Professor of the University of Michigan acknowledges defeat, and quotes Dr. Simpson's "whopper." After a review of this quotation, your familiar illustration of putting a grain or drop of any original medicine into lake Michigan, and giving a teaspoonful once a week, leads us to the conclusion that you fear an explosion of your cranium should you and Duboll figure any longer together, or that you are a moderate Allopathic fabricator. Whichever it may

be, it appears that you have a willing mind and heart in your efforts to deceive the people upon the true principles which guide us in the administration of our remedies and size of the dose.

But we had quite forgotten that we were not exposing the errors and principles which related to the Professor of pathology, practice of medicine, and hygiene in the aforesaid University, but simply addressing our learned opponent, Dr. J. B. HEMINWAY, of Delavan, Wisconsin. Dr. Palmer will doubtless be taken care of by some of the more able members of the profession; we are only laboring for the interests of Homeopathy in our own community. We must say, however, that we occasionally feel as the boy did who knocked his hat off a stump all day for the sake of picking it up, only to knock it off again. Refuting the silly fabricated trash wholly destitute of worth or merit, is certainly playing the part of boy and hat. Nevertheless, if we did not, the masses would suppose you had come off as victorious as the boy did with his hat. Therefore from a sense of duty and as a public good, we are compelled to help crush falsehood, and rid the people of a public nuisance, viz, empiric medication, and misrepresentations of the principles of Homeopathy.

You cannot have overlooked the difference between Hahnemann's decillionth preparation from 3,000 drops of alcohol, mixed in thirty 2-drachm vials, or 3,000 grains of sugar of milk, (considerable less than one pound), and the Allopathic decillionth of a quantity of sugar 61,000000,000000,000000,-000000,000000 times larger than the earth, a bulk of which we have no more conception than of the infinite space of eternity itself.

Now, doctor, when you repeat these assertions you either believe them true or you do not.

If you believe them true, you try and make the people believe that 3,000 drops of alcohol—less than a pint—is “an ocean of alcohol equal to fourteen septillions of cubic miles, or a quantity sufficient to make one hundred and forty billion spherical masses extending from limit to limit of Neptune’s orbit; or in quantity equal to many hundred spheres each with a semi-diameter or radius extending from the earth to the nearest fixed star.”—*Simpson*.

If you do not believe what your authors have written respecting Homeopathic doses, you virtually acknowledge yourself a deceiver, and are trying to falsify our principles, and mislead the people, for no other purpose, it seems to us, than to save your own from falling.

We leave it for you to reconcile the statements, quotations, and figures of your learned professional leaders, for we cannot.

Your figures and doses are alike empirically made and thrown in by the handful.

We once knew a lawyer by the name of Baccus, of whom his colleagues said “he never knew when he was defeated, consequently was always in court with a case.” If our opponents could realize their own defeat, as do those who are looking on with an impartial, unbiased minds, they would not act the part of Baccus and annoy the people with such flimsy arguments which have been repeatedly exposed. For rest assured, whenever efforts are made by your fraternity to press this one point upon the minds of the people, some Homeopathist will hold you up to the scorn and ridicule of the world, and show your want of honesty and principle.

In all candor we ask, what can be your object in laboring so incessantly to misrepresent the plain, unmistakable language of Hahnemann? Do you expect to make the people believe a falsehood? Do you expect to pass unchecked in

these statements, more in keeping with the vagaries of a monomaniac than the reasoning of a philosopher? Would it not be policy for you to represent Homeopathy honorably and fairly? And finally, don't you think you had better act like an honest christian man, throw Allopathy to the bats and wind, follow on in the use of Homeopathic remedies, unite with us in the great cause of humanity, in trying to lift the people from out the filth and mire that surrounds them in the use of Allopathic remedies? You must, however, reduce your doses when you prescribe on the Homeopathic plan, otherwise you will aggravate the symptoms. May that not be the reason of your losing so many patients last year? The smaller the dose the better, if given on the law of similitude.

A distinguished pope is reported to have issued a bull against a comet, and in the name of the Holy Virgin, ordered it to stop. The Yankee said, "the tarnal critter kept puttin' her through on its own hook!" Doubtless Homeopathy will go through on the same independent course, regardless of all the bulls of extermination from Allopathists, or the master problems solved by those distinguished disciples of *Æsculapius*. We heard of a man who lost all his hair by the solution of some great problem, and afterwards rented his head for a billiard ball. Please tell us if it was either of Prof.'s Simpson, Wood, or Hooker.

Leaving you for a few moments' reflection upon the former quotations, we will proceed to a further inquiry into our third proposition, viz: that remedies, to secure a prompt, speedy, and effectual cure, must be exhibited in small and sometimes in infinitesimal doses.

The labored efforts of your school are to force Homeopaths to acknowledge the Hahnemannian principle to be the only true theory of our school, or, that to be a Homeopathist



we are compelled to follow the practices of our great leader in the use of the higher attenuations, and nothing worries you more than to see a Homeopathist use a drop or two of the mother tincture in any given disease. If a Homeopathist gives a remedy to act curatively on his law of similitude, he has a right to use any sized dose he chooses, but necessity compels him to attenuate his remedies in most cases, or evil results follow their use by an aggravation of the symptoms.

We remark in the first place that no Homeopathist ever has or ever will make use of doses so incomprehensible that it will require all the mathematical powers found in the Allopathic profession to figure them out. Neither do we exhaust the numerical value of figures to express their minuteness. We pity the mind which is lost in imagination and wavers over two oz. of alcohol out of which the thirtieth is prepared, when nine-tenths of the whole Allopathic profession can take twice that amount daily and not stagger, and neither mar the mind or conscience. The Homeopathist always claims to exhibit his remedies in doses of sufficient magnitude to accomplish the end sought, viz : the recovery of the patient's health. But these doses, whether of the crude drug, mother tincture, alkaloids, the third or thirtieth dilution, are always given upon the law of similitude, as far as the present state of our system has progressed. And while we are investigating the relationship of drugs to disease, or, as it is termed, the curative power of our minute doses, we wish you to bear clearly in mind that the Homeopathist does not claim infallibility in relation to the specific action of his remedy, not from any failure in his law of cure, but from a want of a correct knowledge of the totality of the symptoms. But we do claim that when they act curatively there must exist between the disease on the one hand and the medicine

that acts curative on the other, a similarity of drug symptoms to those of the disease for which they are given to cure. When this relationship is perfect, the symptoms clearly expressed, and the drug symptoms easily defined, the so-called specific remedy is easily found, and when administered is certain to cure. But should the expression of the disease symptoms present be vague and uncertain, the relationship of the drug to the disease will in the same ratio be uncertain. Therefore it is of paramount importance, yea, absolutely indispensable, that this relationship between the disease present and the curative remedy be clearly defined and rationally understood. The Homeopathist claims to study, and, as far as possible, to understand this relationship between disease and remedy; therefore prescribes intelligently, and almost with mathematical certainty. No guess work will serve him; no random shots at a masked image in the dark: the symptoms being clearly defined, the remedy is clearly and positively pointed out.

But how is it with you? We have before clearly shown that you have no law, no principle, no guide, no light, full of truth, to point out the remedy or remedies to be used. When you exhibit your medicine, it is all by chance and guess work. One remedy is given at random to produce a contra disease. This is followed by another of some kind for the same purpose, and then something else, leaving the adaptation of this contra but newly created drug disease to mere chance for a cure. Hence you never will, nor never can, make an intelligent prescription, unaided by the teachings of Homeopathy. You cannot say truthfully that in your prescriptions you are guided by any therapeutic action of the remedy in which you feel an unshaken or abiding confidence. Are they not all purely empirical, or experimental? In a

•

great proportion of cases are not the results fatal in their consequences to the sick? And when the patient has escaped death by the "skin of his teeth," have not your remedies left a long train of medicinal symptoms more intolerable than death itself? Did not this system of empiric practice originate in the dark days of heathenism, and does not the same practice now exist among ignorant, rude and uncultivated savages? This is a fact, and as such are not the barbarians all Allopathic practitioners? From whence, then, comes your boasted skill? Why are you so opposed to the only law of relationship ever discovered or propagated to the medical world? Why so rigidly oppose the administration of small doses on the law of similitude, or relationship between disease and remedy, when an overwhelming amount of testimony can be produced showing the superiority of Homeopathy over Allopathy in curing disease? Why is it that you seek legislative power to protect your system, and to overthrow ours?

Since we have been penning this very article we have received a letter from a highly respectable Allopathist in Canada, in which he informs us that at the last session of Parliament an act was passed placing Homeopathic practitioners on an equal footing with Allopathists, and that in consequence of this act a counter petition had been sent in requesting Parliament to rescind the act, and prohibit them from practicing or collecting their bills by law.

We remember hearing the testimony of an Allopathist against a Homeopathist, in which he swore the latter had no right to a fee, for there was no merit or power in his remedies. Yet we shall show, by and by, that the greatest cures, according to Allopathic authors, are made by "Mother Nature" and "bread pills;" in fact, the very letter in our

hands acknowledges the former as one of the greatest remedies, and adds, when speaking against our system, "We acknowledge the power of Mother Nature in curing disease," conveying the impression that to this influence alone we were indebted for our success. In defending himself, he also adds: "Allopathy of to-day is not the Allopathy of former times." We would like to see the difference—unless the improvement can be traced to the teachings of Homeopathy.

In view of these facts, why is it that such a bitter persecution is brought to bear against the principles and practices of our school? If Homeopathy is a "mere phantom," "an empty bubble," "a dream," "a wild delusion, without foundation or merit," and if "it will burst of its own accord, and die and be forgotten," why press us so harshly? why use such bitter denunciations? why brand us on every corner of the streets, in public stores and private parlors, as a "quack and impostor?" why do your medical journals refuse to publish every article sent to them by members of our school in answer to their attacks upon Homeopathy, unless they are afraid of exposure and defeat?

Would you have the science of medicine progress, or would you have it fall back to its priestly office, having them invoke the thirty-six demons of the spirit land for the cure of disease; the laying on of hands, the wearing of amulets, or bulls of excommunication of devils, for the monomaniac, or the insane; or other superstitions of rude, ignorant and uncultivated nations? If not, investigate closely the relationship between disease and the remedy sought for its cure. Study also the relationship between the cause producing powers of the one, its size, analysis, and effects; and on the other hand, the law of cure, its effects, and the principles leading to results. Under such investigation, unless wilfully

stubborn, new views, and beautiful theories will unfold themselves in the practice of medicine, which can be found only in the teachings of Homeopathy.

I ask, how is it possible to prescribe intelligently, unless "the nature of the disease, including its structural and functional phenomena, and the properties of the medicine, including the various effects that it is capable of producing upon the structure and functions of the body, are not clearly defined," as well as the curative relationship that subsists between the medicine and the disease? If you do not possess this knowledge, can you feel safe in prescribing? Do you not hazard the life of your patient if you prescribe upon any other principle? and should not the public hold you responsible for refusing this light, so clearly defined in the nature of disease and remedy? Would it not be better for you to spend your time in studying this fundamental principle of Homeopathy than in wasting your leisure hours, playing checkers, pitching quoits, or denouncing a principle which you cannot find taught in any school but ours, and of which you are in gross and profound ignorance.

It is deeply to be regretted, not only on your account, but for the sake of suffering humanity, that a want of candor exists in the minds of Allopathists, as does also in the minds of those adhering to his teachings, against the principles of the reform school. Could this be broken down by reason, and a spirit of investigation take the place of envy and persecution, a new revelation would open up before them, full of deep thought and research. New beauties would present themselves in the great drama of the healing art, viz: that of dependence between disease and the curative power of remedies. But, strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless true, that a certain class would rather die by the use of remedies



in the orthodox way than to be cured by a Homeopathist. We pity the blindness and stupidity of such, but you more for fanning their prejudices into a flame for your good and their destruction.

Oh, what miserable trash is used as arguments to prevent the people from embracing Homeopathy! Oh, what want of candor is manifested by your fraternity in seeking information in relation to the true teachings of our school! Oh, what efforts to keep the people blind and ignorant! Oh, how industrious you are to feed their prejudices, trammel their minds, and bind them to an exploded and worn out system!

But to return more particularly to the power of small doses. A fair representation of the action of a Homeopathic dose can be derived from the following extract from Marcy and Hunt: "No one will deny that the human body during health is constantly being acted upon and disturbed by influences or agents so subtle that neither chemist or physiologist can analyze or even detect them. The simple application of substances to the surface of the body is sufficient to produce direct and permanent effects. Trumbull says that so small a portion as the one-hundredth part of a grain of aconite, made into an ointment and rubbed upon the skin, has produced a sensation of heat, prickling, and numbness, which has continued a whole day. A leaf of tobacco applied to the wrist or sole of the foot, will excite the action of the respiratory muscles, blood-vessels, glands, and skin, causing sickness, nausea, vomiting, etc."

If the leaves of hyosceamus or belladonna be applied to the eye, an effect will be produced which will remain for several weeks. It is asserted by Pereira and Sigmund that "a dilation of the pupils may be produced by only approxima-

ting the leaves of hyosceamus and belladonna to the eye."

"It is well known," says Paine, "that violent erysipelatous inflammation over the whole body is often induced from approaching within a few yards of several species of rhus. poison sumach. The writer knows this from sad experience."

"The wild buffalo scents the hunter for a distance of more than a mile, and hastes from the vicinity of danger."

"The carnivorous bird recognizes the odoriferous particles arising from the dead carcass miles distant in the air, and with hasty wings proceeds upon the prey."

By the analysis of Drs. Falkner, Stein, DeJongh and Bolard, it is ascertained that cod liver oil contains but 1-40,000 part of iodine, and yet this oil is recommended by Allopathists, far and near, for pulmonary consumption, on account of the medical properties of these infinitesimal particles of iron. A desert teaspoonful is the usual dose; the forty-thousandth part of this only being iodine, is equal to quite a small Homeopathic prescription.

The very minutest quantity of natural poison of certain animals, the virus of hydrophobia, small-pox, kine-pox, syphilis and gonorrhea, are sufficient, when placed in contact with an abraded or delicate surface, or otherwise introduced into the system, to give rise to all of their corresponding maladies.

"Miasma, animal exhalations, electricity, magnetism, heat, light, and even mental emotions, are all, under certain circumstances, capable of disturbing the organism and causing dangerous disease," and yet, as Liebig, in his *Animal Chemistry*, truly observes, "with all our discoveries, we shall never know what light, electricity and magnetism are in their essence." We do know, however, the laws which regulate their motion and rest, because they are manifested in phenomena. In like

manner, the laws of vitality, and of all that disturbs, promotes, or alters it, may certainly be discovered, although we may never learn what life is."

### THE LAST ARGUMENT.

The Allopathist, having been forced to abandon every position presented against Homeopathy by fair argument, sound reasoning and logical deductions, now resorts to ridicule, finding it much easier to carry their point in this way than in any other. Occasionally we find one who thinks, by refusing to counsel with Homeopaths, he gives an additional stab to our system, and so elevates his own. It may be so in their own estimation. Wheat struck with rust, or a miserable, withered little nubbin of corn, always sticks up straight. One is all chaff, the other all cob. The wheat head well filled, and sound ear of corn, bow their head humbly towards the earth. "The wise can learn of the simple, but the fool, being wise in his own conceit, can never learn." Homeopathy learns wisdom in the errors of Allopathy, and brings good out of evil. Having truth for her basis, mercy and humanity in her teachings, she willingly extends the light in her possession to those who will receive it. Hence, courtesy is extended to all, that, peradventure, she may do good to some. Others, with apparent professional etiquette, will condescend to counsel with rival opponents, not willingly, but for fear of the lash of an enlightened public, and the loss of their bread and butter, when at the same time they cry "humbug," "infinitesimal dose," "sugar pills," "trickery," "quackery," "moonshine," etc., and boast of being able to "eat a quart of pellets," or "drink a pail full of their medicated water. These arguments are the *ne plus ultra* presented by this class of scientific gentlemen against the merits of Homeopathy. When they are in the presence of those who are not posted

in the principles pertaining to our practice, they, with an apparent degree of honesty, will ask, "How is it possible for the ten-thousandth part of a grain to do any good?" They will also refer you to the mathematical calculation of Profs. Simpson and Hooker upon the merits of a "Homeopathic dose," and then refer to the logical deduction of "putting a drop of medicine into Lake Michigan, and taking a teaspoonful once a week," "lick the bottle or smell the corks of those that have once contained medicine." By thus ridiculing the principles of our school you prop up, for the time being, your rotten, worthless, and rapidly decaying principle. The masses not being able to answer them, take it for granted that this is a knock-down argument against our theory, and swallow still the deadly missiles from Allopathic hands. This question has been answered a thousand times over. It shows a want of honesty, or ignorance on your part, to press this one theme longer upon the minds of the public. It will be well for you to prepare answers to the following questions before you retort upon us so strongly. When you answer these, we will reply to yours.

How large a dose does a man get when he catches the small pox, scarlet fever, measles, whooping cough, or cholera?

How big a dose do you use when you vaccinate?

"A single grain of musk will scent a room twenty feet square for a century and never lose a particle of its weight."  
—*Professor Couchoo, Allopathist lecturer, on the divisibility of matter.*

The laws of Europe make it a penitentiary offence, of not less than three years, to use the scalpel or dissecting knife in any surgical operation, on the ground that the blade cannot be washed so clean but that gangrene can be communicated to the living person, causing death. Tell us, you close rea-

soner, how large is the dose communicated from the cleanly worked blade of silver steel? Figures could not express, nor mind imagine, the minuteness of the particle. Yet death has followed in many cases.

Many persons cannot go within ten rods of ivy without getting poisoned. Weigh us out the size of the dose. Poison sumach will do the same.

The rays of light from a common house lamp penetrate the darkness of night in all directions, for the space of two miles, and with suitable preparation these particles can be detected, or, as it is generally termed, analyzed.

No chemist has been able to detect that infinitesimal particle of poison called the milk sickness, yet it destroys both animal and man. The sting of the bee, the bite of the spider, the breath of the viper, have caused death in hundreds of cases. Light, heat, electricity, magnetism, and the various gases, are all material substances, and manifest a perceptible influence upon the physical body. Will the Allopathist say this is humbuggery, and because the doses inhaled from the poisons are imperceptible, will they deny everything pertaining to common sense, and brag that they can take these things by the quart, and not harm them? Or will they say they are harmless because they are not perceptible in size, weight or measure? The veriest fool would laugh them to scorn if, in the face of accumulated testimony, they should deny this self-evident fact.

We can multiply more proof, showing the curative power of Homeopathic medication, than can be adduced to prove the poisonous and deleterious effects of these infinitesimal particles. Suppose we weigh out a grain of musk and give it to ten thousand persons to smell: they all declare it to be perceptible to the nasal membrane, or the delicate nerves of



the nose. The Allopathist weighs it, and finds it still a full grain. Yet he pronounces these ten thousand persons liars, falsifiers of common sense, a regular set of humbugs, trying to deceive the public? Would not the testimony of this ten thousand have just as much weight with the public as the assertions of the doctor, notwithstanding he still has a full grain? The judgment of the people would sustain the masses in their testimony. Each one of these ten thousand must have inhaled millions of particles, before they could have detected it. How large the dose? Please answer.

Will these sticklers for large doses, deny the power of electricity, because it has neither bulk, weight, or measurement, when they see it lay prostrate the mighty oak, shake earth to its center, and lay man cold in death? Light is also a material, impenetrable, specific, and can only manifest its power when its atoms come in contact with the organ of sight. Newton and others maintain that heat is a distinct, material, impenetrable substance, whose atoms impart to all other atoms caloric producing the sensations of heat. Before you burst or grow faint in blowing about minute doses, please tell us in weight, measurement, or figures, the quantity of sulphurated hydrogen, or carbonic acid gas requisite to cause immediate death, when inhaled? Which is more perceptible to the senses, a Homeopathic dose, or the particles of miasma, measles, scarlatina, hooping-cough, or cholera? Weigh us a dose of either of these, and we will weigh you a dose of Homeopathic medicine.

In 1810 the man-of-war *Triumph* and the schooner *Phip* received on board several tons of quicksilver, and in the space of three weeks two hundred men were badly salivated, two died, and all the animals, cats, dogs, sheep, fowls, canary birds, rats, mice, cock-roaches and bed-bugs, were killed. In

many cases among the men it was severe, resulting in excessive salivation, sloughing of the gums, loss of all the teeth, mouth and throat ulcerated; in others were the most distressing diseases of the stomach, dysentery, inflammation of the periosteum of the bone, excessive derangement of the nervous system, necrosis of the maxillary and other bones, paralysis, rheumatism, ophthalmia, and enlarged liver. You must remember that all these dire consequences were from merely inhaling infinitesimal particles of crude mercury, without the administration of a single grain of the coarse material. We would advise those who cry so loudly against the practice of Homeopathy to examine this subject in the light of science and common sense, for really such ignorance can't find place much longer, in the midst of the growing intelligence of the people.

Although we have given such unmistakable proof of the susceptibility of the system to the influence of infinitesimal particles of various poisons when in a state of health, yet you have the hardihood to unhesitatingly deny that the Homeopathist cures his patient, "because these infinitesimal particles cannot act upon the system when diseased," and frequently ask, "how big is the dose?"

Before we proceed further in our argument, you will please keep in mind that under the influence of disease the system is far more susceptible to the impression of any drug, poison, perfumery, or other substance, than in health. Thus, in the inflamed eye a very small amount of light causes severe pain and in many cases it becomes intolerable, whereas a sound and healthy eye can endure the most powerful rays of the sun's light—unless we look directly at the orb of day.

The sensitiveness of the nervous system to the influence of foreign substances in disease is made manifest in hundreds of

ways. Thus, we have seen severe vomiting on the smelling of a perfumed handkerchief, which in health would have been very agreeable.

The savor from the most delicately cooked meats evaporating through the house, will produce sickness, fainting, blindness, dizziness, and syncophy. This is not at all surprising when viewed in the light of science, for "in health the capillary vessels possess the power of excluding all of those constituents of the blood except the colorless fluid which is its natural stimulant." Although the capacity of these minute tubes is sufficiently large to admit the red globules with ease, yet they are endowed with a peculiar property which enables them to resist their entrance. Paine institutes, "Any cause, therefore, capable of impairing this *natural irritability*, becomes a source of debility and inflammation."

It has been proven that in health most medical substances may become absorbed into the blood. But unless they possess some peculiar noxious qualities, they will act upon those parts for which they have a specific affinity, and be thrown off in the form of excretions, causing in their passage through the structure on which they act only a slight and perhaps imperceptible irritation,—unless the doses are so large that they produce an over action; whereas, when taken in disease the same substances are absorbed with far greater facility, and exercise the same specific affinity for particular parts as in health, but with this difference,—that they make impressions upon the inflamed tissue far more energetic and strongly pronounced than when taken in a healthy state of the organism. Nor is this augmented susceptibility to the influence of the remedy confined to the tissues primarily affected, but the entire system becomes far more impressible than during health.—Hunt and Marey, p. 117.

We have before us three different Allopathic authors, who in speaking upon the susceptibility of the system to the impression of remedies under the influence of disease, corroborate the above remarks. Thus Paine says:

“It appears, therefore, to be a most important law, that a *morbid state* (disease) calls into operation that function of sympathy among organs which, in their *natural state*, (health) manifests but feeble and perhaps no direct relation whatever; and that in consequence of morbid changes remedial agents *will operate* sympathetically, through the stomach, &c., upon remote parts, when they would have no such effect in the healthy states of the organs. New vital relations being developed by disease, our remedies continue to operate through those acquired new relations, as long as they exist.”

Again. In preparation, therefore, as the susceptibility of the system at large is increased by morbid changes, or predisposed by morbid influences, so in a general sense will the alterative action of remedial agents be felt in a corresponding manner.

Upon the susceptibility of the organism in this morbid state and the dependence here acknowledged to exist between disease and remedies, does Homeopathy base one of her unanswerable arguments in favor of using small doses; for the experience of every practitioner, from Hahnemann down to the present day, is, that if the relationship between the disease and the remedy is plainly indicated, then the expression of the remedy upon the diseased organ or tissue becomes the so-called specific in our law of prescribing.

You cannot have failed to notice, from the quotations made from your authors, that we have established one great point, viz. that in a morbid state of the system remedies will act with positive force, when in health they would not be in-

pressed by their action in the least degree. This is the experience of every Homeopathist, therefore from positive necessity he is compelled to attenuate his remedies and administer minute doses to avoid an aggravation of symptoms.

But you ask, "how is it possible for Homeopathists to obtain such prompt action and satisfactory results from the administration of infinitesimal particles of medicine, when we cannot?" For we seldom meet with one of the regular gentlemen but what claim to have given Homeopathy a fair trial, but "found it a perfect failure."

We answer first of all, no such trial has ever been honorably and fairly given to the power of Homeopathic remedies, where they proved a failure, or in any way inferior in their curative action to Allopathy. But on the contrary, we have over five thousand living witnesses, in the United States, converts from Allopathy to Homeopathy, simply by introducing our remedies by way of experiment.

The greater part of these were vindictive enemies to Homeopathy, and instituted these experiments for the purpose of gaining experimental proof to overthrow our system. In these trials their success was so great, and the response to the remedy so prompt, that they became disgusted with Allopathy and turned loathingly away. These are facts known to every member of your school. As a proof of the superiority of our system over yours, it has become proverbial that nearly every member of the army of regulars now refuses to surrender a patient into our hands. Here is where Homeopathists have gained their strongest foothold in the confidence of the people; thousands of patients, abandoned to death by the "heroic gentlemen," have been given back to friends in perfect health by despised Homeopathists. The members of your profession knowing this to be so, positively refuse to



surrender the sick and dying into our hands, lest, peradventure, they might recover, and your actions prove you would rather see a patient die under Allopathic torture than recover under Homeopathic practice. Fifteen or twenty years past, it was not an uncommon thing for the Allopathist to say, "I have done all I can for this patient; if you wish to call any other physician, I have no objection." Not so at the present day, if a Homeopathist is likely to be chosen. You summon the grand sanhedrim of regular gentlemen together, and with united effort and an unbroken front press your rights as a physician, plead the experience of Allopathy, raise the hopes of friends by the use of quinine, opium and brandy, and refuse them the privilege of calling a Homeopathist, until the patient sinks to rise no more.

You fear the power of our derided little pill to such a degree that you never consult the wishes of the patient's friends, never propose that they try a member of our school, until you see you are like to be discharged; then, with more brass than science, you offer to put them on Homeopathic treatment. The devil once showed Christ all the kingdoms of earth and the glory thereof, and offered them all to Him, when the poor cloven-footed, fork-tailed wretch hadn't a foot of soil on *terra firma*, and when you offer the practice of Homeopathy in its purity, you occupy the same position to the public that the devil did to Christ—you haven't these principles to give. The little smattering knowledge you have gained of her principles is less than Prof. Simpson's representation of a Homeopathic dose, but for heaven's sake, and the blessing of the public and the health of the community, the good of the rising generation and that of your patients, continue in the use of what little you do know of her principles. Take our journals, peruse our *Materia Medica*, and act from

personal knowledge derived from the fountain of life and health, and the law of dependence, as taught by our school, between disease and remedies, and we are content.

Personally, you cannot deny these charges. Doubtless you remember M. DEWOLF's child. The morning we were called to see the innocent sufferer, you saw there was a wish on the part of the friends to have us take charge of the case. You reluctantly consented. To try your principles, we asked you if you gave the child up as a hopeless case. You said, emphatically, that you did not. Mr. DEWOLF asked us if we could cure the little one. We said *No*.

Now, what are the facts? The very moment you said there was hope, the child was dying, and we informed Mr. Irish of the fact soon after we left the house. Now why this course? Simply this: You had overlooked the marked symptoms of death; and fearing we might, through God's providence, save the child, you would not admit but that there was hope, even in the embrace of death. And why was it that at that time you claimed to have put the child on Homeopathic treatment? We answer, for one of three reasons: either, first to keep the influence of the family; secondly, because you thought there was a chance for its recovery under this treatment; or, thirdly, you wished it to die on this treatment, so that you could report the failure of Homeopathy.

We regret, sir, that we have to press these facts so forcibly upon you, but we are defending the principles of Homeopathy and the right of her practitioners, not for our own, but for the public good, and as such we shall speak fearlessly, as Luther said, "if there are as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on the roof."

But to return. As a second reason why you do not obtain

such a marked response from a prescription made upon the Homeopathic law, you doubtless use remedies prepared in an Allopathic pharmacy. In that event, you use adulterated, compounded, impure medicines, overheated in their preparation, and consequently the pure drug is either adulterated or destroyed, or the active principle not disintegrated.

For this reason no Homeopathist who values the life of his patient will use any of their miserable compounds. As an illustration, we make the following quotation, the result of a careful chemical analysis of ipecacuanha by Pelletier, who found that "the brown ipecacuanha bark contained only sixteen per cent. of impure emetine; and the red bark fourteen per cent."

According to Berzelius, the impure emetine possesses only one-third of the strength of the pure. We therefore find that of one-hundred parts of crude ipecacuanha only five parts possess the medical virtues of the plant.

Morphia is the true narcotic principle of opium, yet only eight or nine per cent. of this article is obtained from Turkey opium. It is also known that this drug contains not less than fourteen other ingredients besides morphia. "Cinchona, on analysis, is known to contain ten or twelve ingredients."

A recent analysis by the authorities appointed for that purpose in the city of New York, reported that "80 per cent. of the opium found in the market was rhubarb, and 10 per cent. finely ground corn meal. This, however, according to your Allopathic theory, is all right; opium is given to stop the action of rhubarb, and rhubarb to physic off the opium, and the corn meal for gruel. Generally the rhubarb comes first, corn meal next, opium last, or *vice versa*. But the New York druggist saves the Allopathist the trouble of this arrangement, and mixes them for use before selling.

When we first located in this town we were called to see a case of suppression of urine. The symptoms positively referred to cantharides, which was given—two drops of the tincture in a glass half full of water. On calling twelve hours after, we were much surprised to find no improvement in our patient. The relation between the disease symptoms and the drug symptoms seemed still more distinctly marked for the use of the same remedy. Being inclined to rational doses, or rational H<sup>o</sup>meopathy, we concluded to give four drops of the same remedy. On calling next morning, our patient was no better, and we must honestly say, worse. We were really much disappointed,—our first patient to remain thirty-six hours without relief. We were on the point of trying some other remedy, but on comparing symptoms and remedy we concluded that if the law of similitude was correct there could be no mistaking the prescription. We had procured the remedy from one of the drug stores in Delavan. Satisfied that it was not responding, we procured a vial from a friend who had a case and book for domestic use, prescribed the same remedy in the third decimal attenuation, and the patient was relieved from all suffering in four hours.

Here we have a case at hand, where the remedy procured from an Allopathic drug store utterly failed, and yet that procured from a reliable source, C. S. Halsey, failed us not. Had it not been possible for us to have procured reliable remedies, we have no doubt the family would have become disgusted with our practice and the principles of H<sup>o</sup>meopathy. Since his recovery he has remarked to us that he became inspired with confidence in us because we told him that was the remedy demanded in the case, and that remedy *would cure*.

When we expressed our convictions to him that the fault

was in the worthlessness of the medicine, and still persisted in the administration of the same remedy, Homeopathically prepared, in the room of his confidence failing, it grew stronger and stronger. Now, sir, I can simply add that when you prescribe upon the laws of similitude, procure pure, unadulterated Homeopathic remedies, and rely upon it, if you study clearly the relationship between disease and remedy and prescribe accordingly, *there will be no such thing as fail.*

Those who believe in the higher attenuations may think two drops of the tincture in a half a glass of water, a dose once in two hours, was giving it too strong, and consequently aggravated the disease we were trying to cure. Had we not afterwards tried the remedy in the higher dilutions, as well as the tincture, we should have come to the same conclusion, but subsequent trials convinced us that the medicine was worthless. Since then we have not dared to procure our remedies from other than Homeopathic pharmacies. Seriously, Doctor, any time you wish to test the power of Homeopathic remedies over disease, call on us, and we will be glad to have you or any other Allopathist visit our patients with us and see their effects. You will find facts stubborn things to contend against.

We offer as a third reason for the reported failures of Homeopathic medication, that, should your remedies be pure, your want of confidence in our minute doses would lead you to the use of too much medicine, or to administer too large doses. In that event you would actually increase the sufferings of your patient for the time being by an aggravation of the symptoms; for if the relation between disease and remedy be such that it is sustained upon the law of similitude, this aggravation of the symptoms would necessarily follow. Nevertheless, with this apparently unfavorable result, had



you discontinued the use of the medicine, or diminished the dose, you would soon have discovered that a healthy reaction had taken place in the system against the disease, and that a sure and speedy recovery of your patient would have followed.

The more probable reasons for these reputed failures in the administration of our remedies result from a want of honesty, truth and candor on the part of those of your profession who have pretended to use them, and where they have proved successful, report the cures to the credit of Allopathy, as you do the use of those minute doses of aconite and belladonna in scarlet fever. Or you use them when you have lost all hopes that the patient can recover under Allopathic practice, and is in a dying state, with a system struggling with two contending foes, viz., the natural disease and the action of powerful empiric doses; you give a dose or two of something you call Homeopathic remedies, and then report how it failed.

We are sorry to make such statements, but they are attested facts. In this way a regular system of conspiracy is adopted by the Allopathic profession. It not only enters into private practice, but medical boards as a body have entered into the conspiracy and in this shameful manner attempted to crush the growing interests of Homeopathy. In proof of this we quote from Prof. Hempel's letter to Dr. Palmer, page 19 :

"Now, my dear Professor, let me attend a little more closely to the burthen of your lectures. The success which crowned the Homeopathic treatment of cholera during its first invasion, seems to have been selected by you as one of your main points of attack. Let me attend to this subject in the first place, commencing with your manner of presenting the case of Doctor Charge of Marseilles.

“As regards this gentleman’s case, I think a simple perusal of his statement made at the Congress of the Gallican Homeopathic Society, in September, 1857, will show that the Doctor was made the victim of a base conspiracy by the Allopathic physicians connected with the hospital, one of the wards of which had been entrusted to Dr. Charge’s care. I transcribe the following brief resume from the British Journal of Homeopathy:

“In 1854, the Cholera was committing frightful ravages among the population of Marseilles, and all the resources of the Allopathic school seemed to be fruitless to stay its progress or cure the patients when once attacked. Now in a previous epidemic the success of the Homeopathic practitioners had greatly exceeded that of the Allopathists, and as the facts were pretty generally known, public opinion compelled the authorities to apply to the Homeopathic practitioners for their aid in the public hospital against a disease that seemed to defy all the powers of the established system. Dr. Charge, as being the practitioner most distinguished on the former occasion for his success, (in acknowledgement of which he was decorated with the Cross of the Legion of Honor,) was applied to by the Mayor to take charge of a couple of wards in the Hotel Dieu Hospital. To this appeal, which thus made could scarcely be resisted, Dr. Charge responded by undertaking the duty imposed upon him, stipulating, of course, that he was to have an abundant supply of nurses, dressers, flannels, and other necessaries, all of which were readily promised to him. All the patients brought to the hospital were to be sent on alternate days to the Homeopathic and Allopathic wards. The Mayor’s request was dated the 31st of August, and on the 2d of September Dr. Charge commenced his labors. It is true that Dr. Charge resigned his

trust after three reception days; it is also true that during those three days twenty-six patients were received and twenty-one died, as Dr. Boquet, his Allopathic opponent, stated in his letter to the Allopathic Journals, but this letter gave no explanation of the reason of Dr. Charge's retirement, nor of the cause of the excessive mortality in his wards. According to Dr. Charge's account, the promises given by the administration of the hospital in reference to nurses and necessaries were not fulfilled. In the male ward there was but one attendant allowed, and he was soon laid up and useless, so that the Homeopathic physicians had to do the duty of nurses as well as doctors, which of course they could not long continue to do. There was a great want of bed-clothing, flannels, etc.: only one pupil was provided to assist the medical men, and he was soon laid up by sickness. The admission of the patients on alternate days to the Homeopathic wards, which seemed to remove all possibility of a selection by either party, had not that effect, for as patients in the other wards, when they took cholera, as they often did, were transferred to the cholera wards, and as this process of transfer was entirely in the hands of the Allopathic medical officers, an opportunity was thereby afforded them of retaining in their own wards patients attacked by cholera on the day of the Allopathic admission, until the following day, when they might be thrust in a dying state into the Homeopathic wards. This was frequently done, which will account, in great measure, for the extreme mortality in Dr. Charge's wards. In the face of all these unfavorable circumstances, it would have been madness to continue the trust confided to him, all the conditions of which had been so faithfully performed by himself and Homeopathic colleagues, and so vexatiously evaded by the opposite party. Without assistance, without the req-

uisite bed-furniture, with the control of the admission of patients in the hands of adversaries eager to damage the reputation of Homeopathy, Dr. Charge was forced to retire from the unequal contest."

This is a case at point. Ruin or defeat appears to have actuated the movements of Dr. Boquet. That is to say, if Dr. Charge should succeed, Allopathy was ruined, therefore nothing must be left undone that would defeat Homeopathy. Consequently for three successive days he sends the patients from his own ward in a dying condition, and then reports through an Allopathic journal how Homeopathy had been tested and that out of 26 patients, 21 had died. This, sir, is the way your school tests Homeopathy. A dying patient is allowed the consolation of being sent into a Homeopathic ward to die, and then a man destitute of principle reports *he died under Homeopathic treatment!* The same course is pursued in private practice by members of your school.

Do you consider this an honorable course towards a rival school? Does it not show that you are afraid to let us have a fair chance by your side? I would to God that the laws of the united kingdoms of earth compelled every physician to report through the public journals the death of every patient under his practice, and the disease of which he died, and putting upon every tombstone the name of the physician attending the deceased at death, with the practice instituted for his recovery. Then, sir, the scales would fall from the eyes of the public as they did from Paul's on his journey to Damascus, and the glorious light from heaven revealed through the laws of Homeopathy would reveal the new and better way.

Another reason which we offer for your consideration in relation to the propriety of our small doses, is the dynamizing power we gain from our method of

## PREPARING REMEDIES,

By which means we remove everything foreign to the therapeutic action of the drug, or in more explicit terms we believe that by the process of trituration we bring out or set free a dynamic force or principle which is not derived from mechanical or chemical action, and which force cannot be procured through the exhibition of coarse, crude drugs as well as by this principle.

We have previously referred to this dynamic power, lying dormant in the drug. We here resume the subject to more fully illustrate this theory. This is a subject that Allopathists glide over as smoothly as possible. Like our doses, they find it easier to press it down by ridicule than argument.

We have often heard the question asked, "What propriety is there in triturating your remedies so long and faithfully? what do you gain? is not a grain of Allopathic medicine equal to the same quantity of the same drug prepared Homeopathically?" We answer, yes, and no. In weight and measure they are the same, but in potency or power they are not; and for the reason already given, viz: that by the process of trituration and succession we set free a latent force, or the dynamic power, otherwise concealed in the remedy, and the principle thus disinterred becomes the active principle or therapeutic power of the drug.

Marcy and Hunt have illustrated this point very cleverly, and from them we take the following quotations:

"Modern science has demonstrated that by friction, percussion, trituration and mixture, some of the most powerful principles known may be liberated from substances which in a crude state are entirely harmless. It has shown that the more perfectly we can disencumber these particles of their native envelopes, the more potent they become. It has been



shown by the skill of the chemist that the mass of liginous, resinous, starchy, fatty, extricative and coloring matter which surrounds and encloses the active principles or properties of vegetable substances, instead of possessing medical properties serves only to nauseate and oppress the stomach and bowels, thus complicating any existing maladies."

From this starting point in relation to the potency of infinitesimal doses, we would have you bear in mind that it is utterly impossible for any substance in nature to be destroyed. It may be changed, but whatever this change may be, whether in the organic or inorganic kingdom, nearly every substance possesses certain active principles which are latent and unappreciable in the natural state, and can only be called forth and developed by some agent or process which effects a transformation or metamorphosis of the crude material. Thus heat, electricity and magnetism probably exist to a greater or less degree in nearly all substances. Yet it is only through the agency of some active operating physical substance in such a manner as to disturb, or bring about such a condition as will materially change the substance from its original condition, and yet how powerful are their effects upon the system.

Witness, for instance, those infinitesimal particles of electricity disintombed from their prison-house through chemical agents. Witness the convulsions and contortions of the bodies of those persons through whom those molecules are passing; see its zig-zag trackless course across the blackened sky; hear it speak, as with the voice of God, and then rend the mountain cleft, or scatter the broad armed oak to the winds. How is this? The elements have been set in motion by some laws yet to us unknown, friction has disintegrated or disintombed the forces hitherto at rest, but now made manifest in the phenomena we behold from this means. With

half an ounce of sulphuric acid and eight ounces of rain water the electro-magnetic battery can be run for a week with sufficient force to produce intense suffering on a thousand or ten thousand persons to whom it might be applied, and yet nearly the full volume of water and fluid by weight will remain in the glass.

The power which produces the strange phenomenon we witness from the use of the battery, lies concealed in the elements and material entering into the construction of the machinery, and the fluid, by the action of known chemical laws, disintegrates them, sets them free from their entombed state, and by their action we gather results most wonderful. Analogous to this, the process of trituration disentombs the curative particles of our remedies, called by Hahnemann the spirit principles of the drug. Now, sir, will you say these are merely the results of imagination, a freak of the mind, a phantom? Would it be possible for you to convince the thousands brought under the influence of these disintegrated particles so perceptible to the feelings that it was all an hallucination of the mind, and reason them out of the facts just as they existed, because none of the particles possessing this influence could either be chemically analyzed or mechanically weighed and measured? Yet you have as much reason to assume that position as to deny the dynamic power of Homeopathic remedies, produced through our *modus operandi* of preparing them for use. True, we cannot in all cases produce such manifestations by the physical sense of touch, yet they are more susceptible to the sense of smell. You would call us a novice if we would deny the power of the electric current because we could not smell the particles passing through the body. Reasoning transversely we can say the same of you should you deny the action of our rem-

edies on the physical organism. You see the current prostrate man to earth, we see our remedies raise the patient to health.

The quantity of sulphurated hydrogen or carbonic acid gas necessary to kill a man is no more capable of mechanical demonstration than the same quantity of electricity.

“The same magnet may successively magnetize any number of steel bars without losing any portion of its original virtues; from which it follows, that the magnetism communicates nothing to the bars, but only develops by its influence some hidden principle remaining dormant therein.”  
“This force is now known to be molecules in motion.”

The process of triturating our remedies not only develops the hidden or entombed forces, but actually oxidizes them and renders them thereby the more efficient.

“In the decay of animal or vegetable substances, the impure particles so deleterious to health and life when thus let free, can be taken with perfect impunity into the stomach when in a crude or undecayed form.” In a corresponding manner, we gather from our medicines by separating the particles, a medicinal or active principle as potent for good, when correctly administered, as the malarious particles are destructive when separated by decomposition and introduced into the system. We ask you, what difference is there in the power of these particles, whether separated by the action of the sun’s heat and moisture from absorption, or by the laws of chemistry, trituration, or succession? We affirm that the elements of the substance cannot be destroyed. This is an admitted and universal law. We also affirm that the ultimate effect of separating this essence, or essential principle of the medicine, from its crude, gross, material form, is the same, whether done by nature, art, science, or

otherwise. It remains for you to prove the contrary. Professors Dappler, Draper and others, declare that the infinitesimal particles disintegrated from the crude material, "become independent as it were of the laws of gravitation, and move with the greatest facility in every direction, and, as it were, become alive. From that moment only, in our opinion, drugs acquire the capacity of penetrating the organism and of exerting there a curative effect." Do you object to these views? If so, please give us a rational theory of the action of these hyper-microscopical atoms on the organism?

How is it that you account for the influence of these imponderable agents upon the healthy body, when the organs are in apparent vigor, only from the consideration that the system is susceptible to their influence? You must extricate yourself as best you can from a position so uncomfortable to the teachings of Allopathy.

How different under the guidance of our great leader! How beautiful, and still more, how reasonable, are the claims of Homeopathy, which teaches that our methods of preparing remedies by trituration, or "succession," render them analagous to the infections of miasma; that the inert matter is destroyed and the active principle set free, and that the smallest quantity of this active principle triturated with sugar of milk, or diffused in water or alcohol, is capable of communicating, through this means, power sufficient to bring about a reaction of the diseased organ or tissue. Reasoning conversely, which we have a right to do, we have as much ground to expect the highly inflamed system, which is always so sensitive to the impression of drugs, as well as the healthy organism, with all its vigorous powers, will yield to the influence of these imponderable agents.

We may still further introduce some of the more simple

illustrations, showing the power of this dormant active principle when circumstances are such as to develop them.

If a cast iron slab of any length be placed in a planing machine, the friction produced by the chisel in cutting the shaving will develop heat sufficient to give a beautifully coiled shaving the whole length. The heat was in the iron; the planing process only developed its power, and caused the iron to coil.

Two pieces of wood in a turning lathe may be made to ignite by bringing out the latent heat. The hardened steel and flint can be forced together with such violence as to roll out streams of fire. Such arrangements were formerly used for gun locks. This element actually existed in the bodies; the concussion of the two bodies only developed the sparks of fire.

The charge of powder contains a force that rends the mountain cleft, or sends a messenger from Gilmore's "Swamp Angel" a distance of six miles, spreading carnage and death by a power disinterred when it comes in contact with fire. The process of explosion only reveals that element which in a natural form is passive, inert and harmless, but when subject to certain conditions becomes an element potent for good or evil. The power confined in a barrel of nitro-glycerine is sufficient to shake old earth when an explosion takes place. The power necessary to produce these results lies concealed in the agent, and is only manifested when certain conditions are developed that separate the active or explosive principle. A solitary spark is capable of producing the explosive element of a million of pounds as easily as a grain. The decisive moment producing the explosive power consists, not in the quantity of fire or number of sparks that produce the effect, but in the fact that the spark contains an element which disintegrates or lets loose the hidden power contained



in the powder. Apply this principle in administering remedies in minute and infinitesimal doses, and the decisive moment in the therapeutic action of remedies is the moment the law of relationship produces a reaction in the diseased organ or tissue. Disease being a minimum, an infinitesimal molecule, it is reasonable to suppose that an infinitesimal particle of the remedy can produce this therapeutic change as easily as the spark can change the condition of relationship existing between the element exploded and the fire which brings out this power. Reasoning conversely, the argument is simple and plain: Refute the former and the latter dies; sustain the former, you substantiate the latter.

Having hastily shown,—

First, That disease is imponderable and in many instances immaterial, defying the power of any known law to analyze its constituent elements ;

Second, That the system in health is liable to impression of these imponderable agents ;

Thirdly, That there exists a relationship between disease and remedies, by which, if correctly understood, remedies can be chosen according to their therapeutic power to impress the system by the use of imponderable agents or doses as prescribed by Homeopathists ; and,

Fourthly, That this force is the dynamic power produced by the process of trituration, percussion or succession ;

We shall therefore leave you and the reader to draw your own conclusions as to the propriety of administering minute and infinitesimal doses in the time of disease.

We have also shown how basely false are the writings of some of the most able defenders of Allopathy against the teachings of Homeopathy in relation to the size of the dose. And here let me again remind you, once for all, that *Home-*

*opathy is not a dose, but a principle*, and in your future attacks upon our system please bear in mind that Homeopathic principles teach us to give remedies in any sized dose we think the case demands, from the crude drug to the third or thirtieth centesimal attenuation, but that experience justifies the use of the third to the thirtieth, and that these potencies crown our labors with triumphant success.

The fourth leading proposition of Homeopathy is,

THAT IN GIVING OUR REMEDIES ON THE LAW OF SIMILITUDE, THEY VIRTUALLY BECOME THE SO-CALLED SPECIFICS BY SPENDING THEIR FORCE UPON THE ORGAN OR TISSUE ACTUALLY DISEASED.

By which we mean that every remedy in our practice, if given strictly in accordance with the law of relationship existing between the symptoms expressed by the disease and the remedy exhibited for its cure, becomes a specific in its relationship of "like to cure its like."

We shall only make a few brief remarks in this part of our letter, as we have already referred to it in several places.

To illustrate this law of relationship which has given to our remedies the name of specifics, we claim that medicines must act in one of the following ways :

First, upon the law of similitude between the symptoms of the disease present and the remedy chosen for its cure, (Homeopathic law) ; or,

Second, They must be chosen upon the Allopathic law of contrariis ; that is, they must be chosen from the power they have of producing symptoms contrary to those they are designed to cure ; or,

Third, They must be chosen according to the law of dis-

similarity, but not contrary symptoms, for which they are exhibited.

The third proposition, being directly opposed to the teachings of both the Homeopathic and Allopathic schools, is therefore at once set aside. Having no advocates, there is no point to controvert. Dissimilar symptoms are not similar or contrary, therefore the Homeopathist or Allopathist cannot claim the therapeutic action of remedies on this principle. We are therefore left to discuss the first and second propositions.

We will briefly consider the second before we refer to the first. We have previously shown that every medicine when taken into the system produces a set of symptoms peculiar to itself, which are understood to mean the pathogenetic effects, or, otherwise expressed, the medical properties, drug symptoms, or artificial disease. Experience teaches us that after the primary effect a reaction takes place in the system against the action of the remedy, and a class of symptoms the very opposite to those first produced follows, which we denominate the secondary effect of the drug. It therefore follows that nearly every remedy when exhibited in large doses produces two trains of symptoms directly at variance with each other. To illustrate, we will suppose that an Allopathist has a patient suffering from any disease whose symptoms are strongly pronounced. He must aim to cure that disease and class of symptoms by the law of similitude or contrariis. As the first is according to the teachings of Homeopathy, it must be rejected. Consequently he chooses to administer such drugs as will produce a contrary class of symptoms. To accomplish this design he must exhibit large doses; seeking the primary effect. It follows as a rule, that if they have been of sufficient magnitude to accomplish the end sought, viz:

contra symptoms or diseases, that a reaction must necessarily follow which will produce by its secondary effect symptoms similar to those he designs to cure. This is true in regard to nearly all remedies when given on this principle. Thus remedies which produce purgative effects by their primary action are followed by constipation, astringents by looseness, stimulants by depression, narcotics by restlessness. But we ask, is this curing the disease, or is it palliating? Will not the symptoms produced by the secondary effects of medicines given to cure by the primary action aggravate the original complaint by a union of symptoms, and make the patient radically worse by exhausting the vital power? To illustrate: If you have a case of obstinate constipation, you would recommend "mild cathartics," the primary action of which would be to move the bowels; but, sir, would the case be cured? As soon as the primary action has past, would not the same constipated condition still exist? Would not the secondary action of the remedy produce symptoms which with the original disease, greatly augment the suffering of the patient? You dare not deny this. The every day expression of countless thousands of poor victimized Allopathic sufferers will vindicate us in the assertion that you have not, and cannot cure this disease by such treatment. What is true in relation to the administration of your remedies in this case is equally true in nearly all others. It is therefore evident that the curative power of remedies cannot be obtained by the law of contra effects, contra irritation, or contra symptoms, for, as shown on page 60, you cannot produce a contra pathogenetic pain or symptom by any law of Allopathy which can be relied upon as a true curative medicinal expression or relationship existing between disease and drug symptoms.

We admit that you do occasionally cure your patient. But when you do, you are as ignorant as he upon what law, or what principle in the drug, or what relationship existed between the disease symptoms present and the pathogenetic effect of the remedy which produced the desirable change. Your prescriptions are always empiric and unsatisfactory because based upon a routine of practice only, which has followed in the wake of Allopathy for 2,000 years. Name to us the symptoms under which your patient has been suffering during the continuance of any disease, and the dozen remedies, more or less, you have given, and we will tell you which one of them produced the cure. This you cannot do; you have prescribed upon hope, not upon principles known to produce curative effects. You try this remedy, and that remedy, with a vage idea, or hope, of a favorable result. Not so with the Hhomeopathist. Every symptom is carefully noted, and every drug administered is given to meet that symptom upon the law of similitude, known to be correct from actual provings. Now you ask, how can we tell which of the many remedies you have given produced the desired effect, when you cannot? We answer, that as every remedy has its primary and secondary effect, and as the curative power of the drugs rests in their secondary effect, and the provings of the remedy being familiar to every Hhomeopathist, he knows where a symptom exists, that the remedy capable of producing corresponding symptoms primarily will cure secondarily. Therefore your patients are cured by the unfailing law of similitude, derived from the secondary action of the remedy you prescribed to get a primary effect. Therefore you waste your powder, make random shots, and kill or cure by guess.

We therefore sanction the opinion of Dr. Forbes, the most



talented man who ever wielded a pen in defence of Allopathy, who, in defending his craft, has to make the following admission, which we quote for your especial benefit. He says :

1st, "That a large portion of the cases treated by Allopathic physicians are cured by nature, and not by them."

2d, "That in a less, but still not a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature in spite of them. Or in other words their interference opposes instead of assisting the cure."

3d, "That consequently in a considerable proportion of diseases it would be as well, or far better with the patient, in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practiced, if all remedies—at least all active remedies, especially drugs—were abandoned."

"We repeat our readiness to admit these inferences as just, and to abide by their adoption."

What admissions! Simmer them down and we have the following results :

First, That disease is cured by nature and not by the Allopathic physician.

Second, That nature will cure in spite of the Allopathic doctor's efforts to kill.

Third, That patients would generally fare better without Allopathic treatment than with it.

Dr. Forbes knows the power of medicine, and doubtless realized the deleterious consequences following their administration when given by the thousands of reckless practitioners scattered broadcast over the land.

We wish to press home to the minds of our readers the testimony of this distinguished Allopathist. And as he probably comes near the truth, you had better commit this statement to memory, and when you prescribe, act accordingly :

"A large proportion are cured by nature, and not by the Allopathic doctor."

"Not a small proportion is cured in spite of the Allopathist," and of the remainder, after taking out "a large proportion," and "not a small proportion," which have recovered unaided by Allopathic skill, he adds, "a considerable number would have been better off, or "fared better," if the doctor had not interfered.

Now, sir, when you take out a "large portion," and "not a small proportion," and "a considerable proportion," all of which Dr. Forbes emphatically declares are not benefited by Allopathic practice, how many have you left that can look up to heaven and ask God's blessing to rest upon your labors? And what can be the prayers and feelings of "a large portion," "not a small proportion," and a "considerable proportion" that must spend a life of suffering because you administer remedies to produce a curative effect upon a law destitute of any dependence between disease and remedy, and that in consequence of your Allopathic tinkering the nations of earth are maimed and blighted with the effects of medicinal disease.

This admission is but a small proportion of that which we design to bring forward from your own authors, showing how utterly destitute of merit is a practice predicated upon false premises, viz: that remedies cure by a *contra effect contra* symptoms or sufferings.

This key, however, unlocks the secret storehouse of your system, and reveals to the world facts in relation to the good Allopathists are doing the community. Let us analyze these statements:

If you had a hundred dollars, and should tell us you had lost a large proportion of it on a wager, we would take it for

granted that you had lost more than half; for fifty dollars would not be a large proportion of the hundred,—it is only half; the natural inference is that some seventy-five dollars are gone. The next day you lose “not a small proportion,” but we will say only five dollars. On the following day you lose a “considerable proportion” of the remainder. We would suppose the pile about used up, and that you feel nearly “strapped,” which we presume is the feeling many a poor fellow has after passing through a regular course of treatment under Allopathic rule. Your cash account would now balance about as follows :

Cash on hand,	-	-	-	-	\$100.00
Lost on first wager “a large proportion,” say					\$75.00
“second “ “not a small proportion,”					5.00
“third “ “a considerable proportion” of what’s left, say					15.00
					<hr/>
Total loss,	-	-	-	-	95.00
Cash on hand to balance,					5.00
					<hr/>
					100.00

In the light of this explanation, a natural inference drawn from the acknowledgment of Dr. Forbes, let us balance your prescriber’s list :

Number of patients prescribed for,	-	-	100
“A large proportion” not benefited, but cured by nature, say	-	-	75
“Not a small number,” we will say, for humanity’s sake, get well in spite of your efforts to kill,			5
“A considerable proportion” would be better off without your interference, say	-	-	15
Are the other five on hand like the cash to balance account? Oh no! They are dead; you sent them “kiting” over Jordan,			5
			<hr/>
			100

That is, out of the hundred you have prescribed for, none are really benefited.

This, sir, is doubtless the legitimate results which have and always will follow the use of drugs, minerals, or compounds when administered to produce a cure by their primary action. For further proof see statistics further on. Such practice does the people just about as much good as christian England's opium war has done the Chinese, which annually sends 400,000 John Chinamen to an opium smoker's grave. Yet it was a christian act, as the English claim, to conquer forts, sack cities, destroy fortifications, sink vessels, scatter armies, and slay the defenseless people by the thousands and tens of thousands. So with a practice under Allopathic rule.

To procure the primary effect of remedies they are exhibited in large doses, leaving a slow poison in the system which undermines the faculties of the soul as well as ruins the functions of the body. In many instances his prescriptions render a person unfit for business during life. In some instances the story of the patient's sufferings, the disgusting sights, are too sickening for rehearsal, and death horrible beyond comprehension—infamous beyond all others. I refer to death by mercurial salivation, opium, and other Allopathic agents. *Christian England! Christian Allopathists!!* The former carries christian influences with bombshell, cannon, sword, musket and fire; the latter by cathartics, emetics, opium, brandy, and other depleting measures. Tell us, doctor, which kills the most, war or Allopathy? We refer you again to the simple illustration of the Allopathic law of cure found on pages 51 to 62, also to the treatment of consumption, page 66, and the quotations found on pages 62 to 70 of this letter.

After a careful perusal of these, you will readily see why Dr. Forbes came to the wise conclusion he did, and why we have forsaken the cess-pool of this iniquitous practice and embraced the principles of Homeopathy. If the out-and out

killing process was the only evil in Allopathy, we might be content with holding that up to the gaze of an enlightened and long injured public. But the cries of countless millions that are so anxious to escape the thralldom, the whirlpool of suffering, following in the wake of his practice, urges us on in our office of mercy; for the primary effects of the remedy given for the avowed purpose of creating an artificial medicinal disease, induces, according to his teachings, a train of symptoms which are the bane of man's existence, rendering his life an almost intolerable burden.

We make a brief quotation from Paine's Institutes, an Allopathic work, sustaining the assertions we have made. In speaking upon the effects of quinine, he says:

"Experience shows that though the bark and its alkaloids in large doses will often arrest intermittent fevers suddenly, such doses tend either to induce some congestion—especially of the liver, or of the mucous tissues of the stomach, or will aggravate and establish some co-existing congestion; and thus, while the patient is relieved of the fever, *he is dismissed with an insidious local complaint* that not only renders him a permanent invalid, resulting from enduration and enlargement of the liver and spleen, but which local malady may and often does become in the process of time, the exciting cause of another attack of fever."

Wood and Bache, Allopathic authors, in expressing their views upon large doses of quinine say that "it produces gastro-enteritis, irritation, nausea, griping, purging, head-ache, giddiness, fever, somnolence, and in some cases delirium and other stupors," and yet we often hear members of your school boasting of the large quantities they gave, even from a scruple to half a drachm.

A correspondent of the *Medical Gazette*, who is a prac-



ticing physician, comes to the rescue of the babies against what he denounces as their deadly enemy, Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup, showing the probable results of one of your remedies, given upon the Allopathic principle. The writer says he was called to see an infant that was in a dying condition, apparently from the effect of a narcotic poison. He was assured that it had taken no medicine but this "soothing syrup." The doctor took the bottle and had some of the syrup analyzed by a skillful chemist, and the analysis showed that each ounce of the stuff contained nearly one grain of morphine. A dose for an infant three months old, as prescribed by Mrs. Winslow's printed directions, contained an amount of morphine equal to ten drops of laudanum. This is ordered to be given to a child every two hours in certain cases, and double the quantity to a child six months old. As children are very susceptible to the influence of opium, of which morphine is the active principle, four drops of laudanum having been known to kill an infant of nine months, and as the manufacturers of Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup sell annually 100,000 two ounce bottles in the single State of New York, the reader can form some idea of the number of babes that are soothed to perpetual sleep by this nostrum. Mothers had better fall back on catnip tea, if they must have Allopathic practice.

Here we have testimony from one of the most useful journals published, giving the results of a single drug administered only to one class of patients upon the law of contra-action, as claimed by your school. This is but a fair representation of the results following the use of remedies upon Allopathic principles. Every doctor and druggist knows that this is but a mild preparation of opium, and they know its dire consequences upon the little innocent babe, and yet, under

the garb of christianity they sell this deadly trash to the mother to give to her darling babe, when they know that it contains that principle which will cause her to weep bitter tears over the flower early nipped by the use of this mildew of health.

If druggists would sell minute quantities of strychnia, but in sufficient doses to produce death by convulsions, the whole community would rise *en masse*, seek the protection of the law and try them for manslaughter, should they persist in this course. But here we have a drug that carries slow but sure death, and yet it is recommended by Allopathist and druggist "to quiet the baby!" Alas! it is a quiet from which many never wake to weep.

They are as guilty of wrong in the latter case as they would be in the former. In the first instance the mother would realize the results on seeing the terrible convulsions which would follow the administration of the strychnia. In the latter it works insidiously, quietly sapping the fountain of life until permanent medicinal disease is instituted, and finally death ensues by "fatal coma," from which blisters and hot water cannot arouse them.

We thank heaven that we have been the instrument in the hands of God in saving the lives of many innocent babes by warning mothers of the deadly narcotic character of this soothing syrup. How druggists can sell it to unsuspecting mothers, is more than we can tell. But above all, how they can answer at the bar of heaven for these things, we leave for them to consider.

It is unnecessary to multiply quotations. Our object is more to illustrate than to prove the evils resulting from your system of medication. Enough has been said to convince even the most incredulous that remedies given to produce a

primary effect, in large doses, not only endangers the health by introducing permanent medicinal disease from which the power of the system cannot eradicate itself, but often ends in premature death.

How different in regard to our first proposition, viz: that remedies cure upon the law of similitude. "In regard to this relationship it is evident that when in a given case a medicine is administered which is known to be capable of producing in the body a condition similar to that of the disease on the one hand, and that of the artificial drug disease on the other, they must on the ground of their similarity in kind, and place of action, come in direct contact with each other. The result of this is that a reaction of the vital powers takes place in the very seat of the disease, and this reaction being the opposite of the primary action, is nothing less than a reaction in favor of health, in short a return to a healthy action. By sustaining this reaction a short time by a proper repetition of the curative remedy, the disease is entirely removed, and a healthy action permanently established.

"It is this word reaction that explains the matter. When the symptoms of the medicine are the opposite to those of the disease, the reaction being always the opposite of the primary action must be an action in favor of the disease, and so will tend to establish it in the system, even though its primary action has, for a little time, an apparently opposite effect. On the other hand, when the symptoms of the medicine are similar to those of the disease, the reaction being always the opposite of the primary action must be an action in favor of health, and will tend to establish health in the system notwithstanding its primary action seemed to have an opposite effect. This is the relationship between medicine and disease, which constitutes the base of the Homeopathic system. We

invite you to study and examine it with the strictest scrutiny."—*Cockburn*.

We can still further establish this point by an appeal to well ascertained and indisputable facts. I refer to the experience derived from practice, not only in Homeopathy, but the accidental cures under Allopathic medication. As before remarked, so perfect is the law of similitude or relationship between disease symptoms and drug symptoms, that in any affections where the symptoms are strongly pronounced the remedy or remedies which will cure can be easily pointed out, for, as Cockburn says, "on making a collection of all the authentic cases of cure that we can find, which for the past two thousand years have been effected by the use of any medicinal agent, or in which the cure could in any case be distinctly traced to the use of one agent, and making a comparison between the medicinal properties of those different remedies and the symptoms of the disease which they each severally cured, it is truly remarkable that so far as these examinations have been made, the relationship of similitude is most distinctly pointed out, and that the curative relationship on the law of contrariety as advocated by the old school, was actually wanting." You know yourself that every remedy recognized by your school as having a decided specific action is found from Homeopathic provings to possess the relationship or similitude to the symptoms of the disease it cures. As illustrations, you cannot deny that in a healthy or a diseased state of the organism cantharides, copaivae, cubebæ, the turpentine, juniper, squills, digitalis, calchicum, apis, and other diuretics, produce their effects by acting directly upon the kidneys according to the law of specific relationship between the remedy and disease, and all you have to do to post yourself in this matter is to carefully study the

provings of our *Materia Medica* and compare them with the symptoms of your patient suffering from kidney affections. To the Allopathist these remedies are all known as topical irritants, and are considered reliable specifics in your practice for kidney affections. From Homeopathic provings these remedies are known to produce symptoms similar to those of the disease they are intended to cure. Mercury, iodine, and nitric acid exercise a direct specific action on the glands, mucous membrane, and skin. Also ipecacuanha, tartarized antimony, phosphorus, senega, etc., when taken into the stomach exert a specific action on the lungs. Aloes, gamboge and colocynth act specifically upon the stomach and rectum, while senna, rhubarb, jalap, and certain other cathartics spend their force upon all portions of the alimentary canal. Ergot, pulsatilla, tansy, erigeron, etc., operate specifically upon the uterus. Belladonna, hyosceamus, opium, and stramonium impress more specifically the cerebrum, or other portions of the nervous system. In this way we can go through with nearly every remedy in the *Materia Medica*, and show from our provings that each has a certain tissue or organ which is more easily impressed by its influence than another, or in other words that every remedy has its own particular organ or tissue to impress, and that if this or that organ or tissue is diseased the remedy or remedies capable of impressing it with similar symptoms in health will appropriate these same medicines to bring about a healthy action.

It is asserted by Flarens that "opium acts specifically on the cerebral lobes, that belladonna in a limited dose affects the tubercular quadrigemina, and in large doses the cerebral lobes; also that alcohol in a limited dose acts exclusively on the cerebellum, but in a large quantity it affects also the



neighboring parts ; and also that nux-vomica particularly affects the medulla oblongata.”

From the researches of Marcy and Hunt we learn that the experiments of Magendie, Blake, Pereira, Rau, Liebig, Mueller, Orfila, Griesselich, Matteucci and Phillip prove conclusively that most morbid and remedial agents, when given in massive doses, prove their effects after having been absorbed into the blood.” It has also been proven with equal certainty that foreign substances when absorbed into the circulation are conveyed to those structures for which they have a specific affinity, and these make a specific impression which modifies the function of the parts according to the nature of the agent and the predisposition of the individual, the blood serving as a conducting medium merely, and if the absorbed substances do not possess the power of exercising an influence upon any tissue, they may continue to circulate through the lungs until inspired air gradually neutralizes them, or they may remain for an indefinite length of time, as sometimes happens in cases of hydrophobia, virus, fever, and miasms, without affecting the system, and yet retain their activity. The reason of this may be that the tissues upon which they act are in so perfect a state of health and vigor as to be able to resist the power of the noxious agent until some cause shall enfeeble the part to be effected, and thus predisposed, it receives the injurious impressions.

During the past year a lady suffering from gangrene of the mouth called upon one of the Allopathic doctors of this place for consultation. The mouth was certainly in a very bad state. Sloughing ulcers were observed on the gums near the teeth, the gums were very red and inflamed and consequently swollen ; the surface of the ulcers appeared jagged, and covered in various places, with cream colored spots. The cheeks

and tongue were also in an equally unhealthy state. The doctor at once recommended blue mass. Were he to use it as prepared by Dr. Cutter, formerly, each pill would contain one-twentieth part of a grain, about the four hundredth part of an old fashioned Allopathic dose. Here we have a very consistent Homeopathic prescription. The four thousandth part of a grain would have done much better, provided it had been prepared in that potency, thoroughly triturated with sugar of milk.

Here one of the most vehement enemies of Homeopathy is actually prescribing mercury upon the very principles of similitude, the great homeopathic law which is dismembering his own school of all its glory. It also furnishes us with another argument too strong to be misconstrued, viz: that when he utters foul slanders about the principles that guide us in the selection of our remedies, his motive is personal injury to us and our system of practice. If he prescribed intelligently, that is, according to the therapeutic power of the remedy over the disease for which he recommended the blue mass, he did so upon the law of dependence between disease symptoms and the power of the remedy in producing corresponding symptoms.

This regular gentleman knew that mercury in large doses would produce a similar condition in the mouth; yet he prescribed this on the Homeopathic law to cure. He did not wish to salivate the lady; he only wished to produce an impression. This is just what all Homeopaths claim, *no less and no more*. And every judicious Homeopathist exhibits his remedies for this same purpose, and if selected upon the law of similitude they will bring about a healthy reaction in the very organ diseased. This experience is gained, not by experimenting with cats, rabbits and dogs, or upon a poor, af-

flicted, dying patient, but upon individuals in perfect health. By this means he gains a perfect knowledge of every organ or tissue impressed by the remedy, and knowing the truth of this law of like to cure like he prescribes intelligently, knowing the result will be a reaction of the system in favor of health, in fact a return to health. Here again we must bring another Allopathist up to the snubbing post, a position rather uncomfortable for a man who is so vehement on a "Homeopathic quack, who only began to practice last fall." We ask this regular why he prescribed mercury to cure this sore mouth if it was not upon the Homeopathic law of similitude? If he wished to prescribe upon the Allopathic law of contraries, what new disease did he wish to set up? What organ or tissue did he wish to impress in order to cure this lady's sore mouth?

Should he say that the pathological condition of the system was such that he wished to produce an impression upon the liver, or in the mesenteric glands, the gastric follicles of the stomach, or the salivary glands of the mouth, and that the four hundredth part of an Allopathic dose would do it, why in heaven's name condemn and even eternally damn a Homeopathist for advocating the same law? This law and his prescription was right; nevertheless had his dose been ten times smaller and prepared upon the Homeopathic principle it would have done just as well. The impression would surely take place if the pathological condition of the patient was such that the therapeutic action of mercury was Homeopathic to the disease.

Doubtless the gentleman will say the dose he recommended was larger than any Homeopathist would have given. This may be so. Nevertheless it was upon our law of similitude, for mercury will make a similar sore mouth, and

as a Homeopathist we know it will cure. Here we repeat what we said once before, that "Homeopathy is not a dose, but a principle," and the principle in this case is, that the lady had a sore mouth similar to that produced by mercury, which she wanted cured, and this Allopathist prescribed mercury to cure it upon the Homeopathic principle that like will cure like, and as the size of the dose is always left to the judgment of the physician, we would probably recommend one ten times as small, but worked over ten times longer, and more efficient in curing. Should he say he could have impressed any or all the glands referred to above with this remedy because it is an Allopathic specific, or, if you please, from its specific action, then he admits the Homeopathic law of dependent action between disease and remedy, and from the fact that he did recommend very small doses, he admits what we claim, that these very small doses will cure when this law of dependant action exists, and not otherwise.

But should he now take the opposite ground, and oppose this law of dependence existing between disease and remedy, the law of similitude as well as the law of small doses, he will doubtless admit that he prescribed to cure the lady's mouth, or he did not.

If he prescribed expecting to cure a sore mouth with a remedy capable of making a sore mouth, he did so upon the Homeopathic principle that like will cure like. If he did not expect to cure, he acted the part of a deceiver or an impostor in his profession, a position that we can hardly think him capable of occupying, although in our opinion he has done worse a good many times since we came here.

If he takes the first position he admits our law of similitude as well as of small doses. Should he deny both of these principles he must take the old Allopathic principle of empir-

ic medication, and say he only prescribed hoping to effect a cure.

The scribe rule of cutting and trying will hardly stand the test among first class mechanics, and it is high time the people learned that the science of medicine is above all others the highest, and, as taught by the Homeopathist, is based upon truth and established laws as well as are the laws that govern the movements of the heavenly bodies.

Why not have law and order in the practice of medicine as well as in everything else? Must the highest and most important of all sciences be surrendered to the Allopathic hatchpot of vague, incoherent ideas, gathered and instituted in the days of barbarism, and fed by the wild fancy of those who believe in a law destitute of any dependence existing between the sufferings of the patient and the remedy administered to cure his disease? Must man, the noblest work of God, be left, amidst the sufferings that wreck his system, to a practice that has gained its knowledge of the action of remedies by experimenting upon cats, dogs and rabbits, or the experimental knowledge derived from the afflicted patient, when such knowledge, owing to the various conditions of the system, would ultimate in discord, confusion and inharmonious views so widely at variance with each other that the physician can only prescribe upon a hope of success, without any law to guide him in the selection of his remedies? Forbid it, merciful heaven!

In all departments of nature we find law, order and harmony pervading. Even the various phenomena which we observe in nature are but the expression of some definite, fixed and unalterable laws working in accordance with pre-established principles which, when developed, produce the phenomena we so often witness. The very wind that sweeps



across the plain, or sets in wild confusion the billows of the mighty deep, are but the result of regulated and well known principles, which the skillful mariner knows how to take advantage of for the protection of craft and crew. The zigzag lightning playing in the black vaults of heaven, the electric spark that conveys the intelligence, either of peace or war, from king to president, are but the results of well known principles. The former acts in perfect harmony with the divine law, as much so as the latter does to the will of man. Law and order govern the phenomena of both. The locomotive winds its way across the continent, prompt to the very minute, and the floating palace of the sea rides proudly the rolling billows of the Atlantic deep, to the very hour. By known laws the deadly shell is sent howling through the air to the enemy's camp and bursts with the besom of destruction at the very second and place designed. The astronomer, guided by eternal laws upon which his science rests, soars amidst the constellations of heaven, tells of God amidst the Pleiades, follows the comet in its rapid flight, and predicts its return hundreds of years hence to the very day; yea, and can absolutely tell the appearance of new planets, and other phenomena which *must* follow, from certain fixed laws of Deity. Shall it longer be said that the science of medicine, —the curing of the sick, and relieving pain,—so God-like, so divine in its nature, is left to mere chance or guess work? Are the divine laws wanting in this particular? Is this the only department in all art or nature where a want of harmony and order prevails? Must the physician prescribe without law, without principle, or without a perfect knowledge of the effect he is producing by his practice? Let the shipwrecked millions that line the coast of the disturbed and tumultuous sea of Allopathic practice answer these questions,

for doubtless you will not. And let the thousands who are still placing their lives under the care of your system remember that you are like the ship at sea without compass or rudder, driven hither and thither at the mercy of the waves. It is truly astonishing when such facts are known, and the withering influence of disease is sown in the physical body from every drug given under the Allopathic system, and the low moans of death follow wheresoever he rules, that the people of this enlightened age will so vigorously help him in his efforts to crush out the only true law ever discovered for treating disease. But such are the facts. The prejudices of the people—we mean the illiterate masses—are such, that they would prefer to die by cathartics, emetics, blisters, cupping-glass, opiates and lancet, rather than be cured by the mild, humane principles of Homeopathy.

We have hastily shown you—

*First*, That remedial agents operate in the same specific manner, both in health and in disease.

*Second*, That in disease the organism of the system is far more easily impressed by the action of remedies than in health.

*Third*, That imponderable agents do impress the system, both in health and disease, and inasmuch as the system under the influence of disease is more easily impressed than in health, it abrogates the necessity for the use of large doses.

*Fourth*, That if a given remedy is prescribed to cure a certain disease during certain periods, the same remedy can produce pathological lesions analogous to those which characterize certain diseases, which pathological condition is the only true law that can exist between disease on the one hand and the remedy on the other.

*Fifth*, That remedies administered upon this law of de-

pendence between the pathological condition of the system on one hand and the remedy capable of producing a similar pathological condition on the other, is what is understood by our law of specifics.

*Sixth*, That the accidental cures made by Allopathists are easily traceable to this law.

*Seventh*, That this law can only be found by administering remedies to produce a secondary, and not a primary effect.

*Eighth*, That this law of dependence between disease and remedy is not an isolated theory, but the great fundamental law which must guide all medical treatment if we wish to work in harmony with Deity.

Neither time nor space will allow us to follow this part of our remarks any further. We have given abundance of proof to establish the propositions enumerated above, and, until refuted, they must appear as arguments against your system of medication. Here we propose to let this part of our letter rest and answer the one great question so often asked by Allopathists and those who disbelieve in the Homeopathic practice, viz:

#### WILL SMALL OR INFINITESIMAL DOSES CURE?

To this interrogation we answer affirmatively. But an answer to an interrogation is no proof, and will not be received as such by the skeptical or inquiring mind without satisfactory evidence. This we propose to introduce.

On the 103d page we lay down the following proposition: That inasmuch as our remedies are given upon the law of specific relation, and that as their action can be calculated with almost mathematical certainty, and that as disease and other imponderable and immaterial agents do act with positive and decided force on the healthy and unhealthy organism, it abrogates the necessity of influencing healthy parts or

of debilitating or destroying the function of any organ in health to produce radical cures.

We start out with the following proposition, viz: Where two principles are directly at variance and opposed to each other, one or the other must be false; or in other words, if one is true the other is false.

On this hypothesis, the principles of Homeopathy and Allopathy cannot both be true, as they are directly at variance with each other. The same arguments that prove one false, prove the opposite side true. This is a fair and honorable way of arguing. If, therefore, we show the principles of Allopathy to be false, we by the same argument prove Homeopathy to be true.

We have repeatedly shown what the Allopathic law is, and that in the administration of his remedies he gives crude drugs in large doses, on the law of contra irritation.

But we ask, do you cure disease, and if so how? You know not—yet the Homeopathist does. In the last section we admitted that you did occasionally cure your patient. We also showed that you were in profound ignorance as to how it was done, or what remedy produced the desired result, and that consequently, your cures were made by accident. We also proved conclusively that these cures were produced from the secondary action of the remedy in the room of the primary. The former being Homeopathic principles, the latter, Allopathic.

We therefore refer you again to a careful reading of those pages for the principle there illustrated contains the major part of the one we now propose to answer; or in other words it is the key which unlocks the store-house of wisdom requisite to an understanding why these infinitesimal doses contain such therapeutic or curative virtues.

If the results following the principles upon which Allopathy predicates his remedies are so unsatisfactory that his leading members, and authors of approved worth and integrity, are continually expressing dissatisfaction, or uttering eternal protests, because of the wide spread havoc that follows his footsteps wheresoever he goes, the natural inference is,

First, That there must be a defect in the principles which guide them in the selection of their remedies; or,

Second, There must be a deficiency in the judgment, merits and qualifications of the multitudes who are practicing upon that system; or,

Third, That they are writing falsehood against their own system of practice.

Should you admit the first proposition, you grant just what we claim.

Should you take the third proposition, you place those holding the highest positions of honor in your ranks in a very uncomfortable, if not a dishonorable position. For the great multitude, the rank and file in your school, are the legitimate, professional offspring of the men which compose the head and front of the Allopathic school, being directors and professors of medical colleges.

To grant the second proposition would brand them with granting diplomas to men not qualified to practice, thus making doctorates an article of traffic, to be placed in the hands of such as possess the requisite amount of greenbacks, whether they have other qualifications or not. If this is the case, they are no better than blacklegs, pickpockets and gamblers. In fact, they are worse, for the latter only destroys the pocket and blasts the reputation, while the doctor not qualified to practice not only drains the pocket but sends his patients "kiting over Jordan."



You cannot admit the third proposition, as that is contrary to all reason. Therefore of three evils you will choose the least, by defending the first proposition. It is hard for you to admit that you are practicing upon a system based in error, but it is much better to do this than to admit either of the others. Thousands are conscientiously doing this to-day, not only in the practice of medicine, but in religion and politics. Therefore, with the mantle of charity, we will suppose this to be your position. But we shall strip you of the garment before we are through; divest you of all the honors claimed by this most ancient of dogmas; and hold up to the gaze of an outraged public some of the errors of this defunct system.

To oppose this proposition will first be to explain its teachings.

Allopathy teaches—

First, "That disease is cured by contra irritants, depletion, etc., and consequently aims to direct his remedies to operate on parts which are healthy, or if diseased to produce contra-irritating symptoms."

Second, "Allopathy employs enormous quantities of poisonous drugs for the express purpose of creating artificial diseases in healthy parts."

Third, "He also prescribes for various groups of symptoms under the same general name."

Fourth, "Allopathy continues the same routine of practice which has existed for thousands of years past, and which has come down to him through the ignorance of ancient barbarism and handed down by tradition from the sorcerer, alchemist, and humoral pathologist."

Fifth, Allopathy also announces numerous and contradictory laws, both of theory and practice, yet prescribes empirically, regardless of even his own peculiar adopted theory.

Sixth, Allopathy is careful to select a remedy appropriated to cure a disease having a certain name, because it has cured a disease of the same name on a former occasion.

Seventh, Allopathists seek to gain the therapeutic action of remedies by experimenting upon cats, dogs, rabbits, pigeons, etc., or from experience gained from the bedside, or from their botanical and chemical properties, infer their medicinal use or curative range.

Eighth, Allopathists, knowing nothing of the law of dependence existing between diseases and remedies, are left to the Yankee's principle of "guessing" they are right, or "reckoning" this or that remedy will cure, and to make sure work he mixes as many together as he "calculates" will kill the disease or patient. This is pretty sure "calculation," for as the doses are designed to reach all parts of the system at once, he loads and fires accordingly, making in many cases sure work of death.

Ninth, Allopathists think it advisable to give a dose of sufficient magnitude to "work itself off," "to blow him out straight," "to have an alterative or derivative effect," "to get up a reaction," "to carry off the poisons from the blood," "to stir up the liver," "rake out the stomach," "cramp the guts," "reduce the patient," then "raise him by whisky punch, brandy or quinine," and at last to "let him have rest by opiates." Ah, a long rest, too!

Tenth, As a finale, we give Dr. Hooker's definition of modern Allopathy. This gentleman, you doubtless remember, has "spoke a piece" against Homeopathy. In speaking it he defines with great clearness and precision this most beautiful theory. He says: "But what is Allopathy? Is it one thing, one mode, one system? By no means. This term is applied to all kinds of practice pursued by all regular physi-

cians. It is a very extended, and a very diversified combination. It includes much that is good and much that is bad. And the practitioners of Allopathy are some of them bad practitioners."

This definition of modern Allopathy fully corroborates the views entertained above of the system you sustain, and justifies us in the belief that the proposition we are assuming of the Allopathic practice is the only true solution for his want of success; viz: that he predicates his practice upon principles foreign to the true theory of curing disease; producing disease and death for the want of a law which governs the therapeutic action of remedies.

How different with the Homeopathist. With him there is a fixed *law* of cure. In whatever part of the world the physician is called to attend suffering humanity, he is guided by that law; and thus guided he may with certainty prescribe for a case, whether he has ever seen a similar one or not, and even though another such may never have occurred before.

It matters not how diseases may vary at different times and places, and under different circumstances, the medicines will also be varied to suit. Following not *experience*, that most deceitful guide in medicine, the true Homeopathist observes only the one universal rule; always adapting his treatment to the disease as it *is*, and not as it *was*.

On the other hand, in "orthodoxy" there is no law or general principle. As the writer says: "The private judgment of the individual (physician) is the only safe criterion; and he should be answerable to his own sense of right and wrong." That is, being educated in anatomy and physiology, and being told all about diseases as they *have been*, and how various medicines *have acted* in certain cases, he is to treat

patients committed to his care as *he may think best*, or, in Yankee phrase, as near right as he can guess !

How great the responsibility ! How doubtful the result ! In the midst of conflicting authors and professors in "regular" practice, without a principle in which they all acquiesce, to enlighten and guide, he is to go from the halls of learning to grapple in deadly conflict with the destroyers of his race. When, in the tumultuous scenes of active life, he comes to face those destroyers, whose tactics are ever varying, he is unable to recognize them as the same old enemies whom his fathers fought. The plots and forms, the "regular" rank and file in which he was trained, are of little or no service to him now. Either the destroyers are new, or, if the same, come in other forms, and fight so differently, that he must fall back upon his private judgment, and fire away, hit or miss, kill or cure. Years pass in such a guerilla warfare, before he has learned that, in the aggregate, he kills as many friends as foes, and concludes thereafter always to "wait for developments," or to resort to the common course of calling counsel, before he ventures to open the old batteries, which hurl powders, pills and boluses, blisters, cups, and lancet, with such terrible effect.

We would here remark, in reference to the art of healing which we advocate, that we do by no means contend that it is *perfect*. While our therapeutic law is as firm as that of gravitation, and while our other principles are perfect, we freely acknowledge that those parts of the system depending for their value upon our fallible judgments and labor, are yet greatly to be improved. To seek out and try new medicines upon the healthy, will be a work not perfected till all substances containing power to vary the conditions of human nature have been thoroughly tested, and the test subjected to our use.

Our limits being as wide as the kingdom of nature, embrace all medicines or agents which are capable of manifesting their character and power in the healthy human organism. He who thinks, because we follow one general rule in the use of remedies, that we have but "one idea," that our field of research is small, that we are "quacks," knows not the alpha of our science.

That Homeopathy is an "exclusive system," so far as empirical dosing with mixed and murderous drugs are concerned, and so far as the other "heroic" measures of "orthodoxy" go, we not only freely acknowledge, but most cheerfully proclaim.

"This is the head and front of our offending."

Probably there can be no better way of presenting the truth of the proposition we are laboring to establish, than to make a few more quotations from your authors; and if these do not prove our oft repeated assertion that the "regular" gentlemen were left to prescribe at random, without the first law of dependence between the disease and the therapeutic power of the drug, they will establish Dr. Hooker's definition of modern Allopathy, as given above.

A very eminent English writer by the name of Andrew Boord, "Doctor of Physicke," gives an elaborate dissertation upon the nature and treatment of

### PLEURISY.

After giving the Latin name, he adds: "In English this is called Pleurisy, which is an imposthume in the cenerities of the bones. But there be two kinds: one is inward and in the gristles of the bone, and the other is in the lacertes in the brest, and Isaac saith that it is a hot imposthume that is ingendered in the midriffe named deaphragme."



### “THE CAUSE OF THIS INFIRMITIE.

“This infirmitie doth come of a fūnish blood, and of an hasty heart, which doth perturbate either the joints, or else the heart and stomach with the breast.”

Now comes the treatment, or, as he says,

### A R E M E D Y .

“First, if the part,” mark the expression, and remember he is writing of *pleurisy*, “in the gristle of the bone, and lascertes in the breast,” or, according to Isaac, “an hot imposthume in the midriff,” “be constipated, take an easy purgative, as *cassia fistula*, and I have knowne olde ancient doctors in this matter to use phlebothomine, the which I never did use in this matter, considering the periculisness of it.”

On the 61st page we referred to a case of mania, and the discussion between the two Allopathists in attendance relative to the cure. Here we will introduce the views of Andrew Boord from whom we have just quoted. He says:

### “M A N I A .

“In English it is named he, or they, the which be mad, and possessed of the develle, or develles, and their propertie is to hurt and kill themselves, or else to hurt and kill any other thinge, therefore let every man beware of them and keep in a sure custody.”

### A R E M E D Y .

For the cure of this malady Dr. Boord advises that patients be sent to Rome for the following Allopathic treatment:

“For within the precincts of St. Peter’s Church, without St. Peter’s chappell, standith a pillar of white marble, grated around about with iron, to the which our Lord Jesus Christ did lye in himself at his delivery unto Pilot, as the Romans doth say, to the which pillar all those that be possessed of the develle, out of divers countries and nations, be brought thith-

er, and as they say in Rome, such persons be made there whole.

“Among all others, a woman of Germany, which is 400 miles and odde from Rome, was brot to the pillar, I there being present. With great strength, and violently, this woman was put into the pillar within the iron grate, and after her did go in a priest, and did examine the woman under this manner, in the Italian tongue: ‘Thou develle, or develles, I do adjure, by the potential power of the Father, and of the Sonne, our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the virtue of the Holy Ghost, that thou doe show to me for what cause that thou doest possess this woman.’ What words was answered I will not write, for man will not believe it, but wolde say it were a foul and grater lye, but I did hear that I was afraid to tarry any longer, lest that the develles should have come out of her and entered into me, remembering what is specified in the chapter of St. Matthew where that Jesus Christ had made two men whole, the which was possessed of a legion of develles.”

Here this distinguished disciple of Old Physic emphatically declares great cures were made by sending their patients to Rome, from this pillar of marble. But the writer appears to be in a great quandary to know whether the cures reported were from the efficacy derived from the stone, or the power of the priests. But after a long and learned discussion, examining and sifting evidences, he decides in favor of the Priests.—*Marcy*.

It is worthy of remark that the German woman examined by the priest received somewhat different treatment from American ladies examined by German doctors; and also that the doctors feared that the devils would hunt up their old home. See Matthew, chapter 8, 28 to 34.

It is evident, therefore, that Allopathy is not "one thing, one mode, one system," but is "exceedingly diversified in its combination," "including much that is bad." May we not, then, consider it a regular hotch-pot of vague ideas, of the most diversified and contradictory character? And why? Because it is derived empirically from all sorts of sources, including Indian remedies, quack nostrums, grannies recipes, as well as college formulas, containing sometimes a dozen or more remedies, empirically chosen, and as recklessly given. We accept Dr. Hooker's definition of Allopathy as one of the best we ever saw, and his "diversified combination" doubtless refers to the "powders of bulls' tails, boars' teeth, man's skull, maiden's hair, cats' brains, burnt owl, swallow's nests, volatile salts of worms, burnt shoes, serpents, toads," etc. But if this does not afford diversity enough to suit the wild fancy of the next Allopathist, he can add to this very diversified combination the excrements of hens, peacocks and turkeys, the urine of horses sheep and oxen, horse and hog dung dried and pulverized to powder, hog's and goat's blood, crab's eyes, viper's grease, hog's lice, sheep ticks, and bed bugs; or if this diversified combination does not please another, he may add that which is still more revolting to the feelings of the pure in heart—the imported practice for female diseases, or the cathartics, emetics, blisters, cupping-glasses, setons, bleeding, mercurial salivation, and splitting of tongues, recommended by modern Allopathists. Truly, it is not "one mode, one thing, one system." It certainly contains "much that is good and much that is bad," but which in all of the above quotations will you call good, and which bad? Your patients generally have no choice,—you choose the nostrum, they swallow the dose. Some, however, have a preference for the imported system, and of course have a right to choose it.

Do you still think it best to hang to the first horn of the dilemma, viz: that there must be a defect in the principles and law which guides the Allopathist in the selection of his remedies? If not, continue the use of the compounds recommended as remedies, and quoted above. If you prefer the other, admitting a deficiency in judgment, merit and qualifications of the multitudes who compose the rank and file of your school, then brand your collegiate boards with want of honor or principle in sending forth hordes of men not qualified to practice. Deny the first proposition, and you must admit the second, or deny the second and third and you must admit the first.

As before remarked, we think the fault rests, not in a want of knowledge of the different branches which go to make up the necessary qualifications for a professional man, but in the law of *Contra, Contrariis, Curantur*.

We are led to this belief from the following reasons:

First, The statistics from all parts of the world in our possession, show that Homeopaths cure by far the greatest number of their patients. See this proof further on. (Consult index.)

Second, The greater portion of the medical writers in your school are more or less disaffected, and in moments of candid reflection express themselves in a manner that leaves no room to misunderstand that they have no confidence in the Allopathic practice.

Third, Many thousands of these disaffected practitioners are rapidly forsaking his ranks and coming over to Homeopathy.

Fourth, We are sweeping by the board the great majority of scientific men in this country, and large numbers in the old, among whom may be included professors of colleges, semi-

naries, and high schools, the clergy by nine-tenths, lawyers by three-fourths, and more than three-fourths of all the editors of newspapers, journals, etc., as well as a large majority of the intelligent masses. In the single state of Michigan we have a population of 450,000 Homeopathsists.

Fifth, We seldom find persons who, when once thoroughly acquainted with the principles and practice of Homeopathy, are willing to accept any other. Occasionally we find those who are dissatisfied. Since we have been in this place we met a gentleman who addressed us in the following language :

“ Well, doctor, you appear to be doing a good business,—much more than any other physician. I don’t know but what you’ll succeed, for the fools are not all dead yet. As for me, I am done with Homeopathy. I lost one dear little child under Dr. ——’s treatment, and that will answer for me.”

“ Did you never lose any under Allopathic treatment ? ”

“ Yes.”

“ How many ? ”

“ Three.”

“ Then it appears that the loss of three children under Allopathic treatment does not satisfy you, but because a Homeopathist lost one, you pronounce the whole thing a system of humbuggery. Is that your position ? ”

“ Yes ; there is not enough of it to amount to anything.”

Since that time I have learned that the man is living with his third wife. I only refer to this as a fair sample of those who oppose Homeopathy. This gentleman supposed that Homeopathy was a dose, and not a principle, which is the view you are constantly pressing upon the minds of the people. But where the principles of Homeopathy are clearly understood, as well as those of the Allopathic school, if people are so situated that they cannot secure the services of a Homeopa-



thist, you will generally see them husbanding a book and case of our remedies, and on these they will depend. But Allopathists they have learned from past experience fearfully to dread and let alone.

Let us present facts to sustain our first proposition, and if this evidence shall condemn you, how great must be your condemnation.

Though at the risk of a repetition of argument, we will introduce the testimony of the talented Dr. Forbes, once Physician Royal to the Queen of England, and by all means worthy of this distinction.

In the Foreign and British Medical Review we find the following language:

First, "That in a large proportion of the cases treated by Allopathic physicians, the disease is cured by nature and not by them."

Second, "That in a lesser, but still not a small proportion, the disease is cured by nature in spite of them. In other words their interference opposes instead of assisting nature."

Third, "That consequently, in a considerable proportion of diseases, it would fare as well or better with the patient, in the actual condition of the medical art, as more generally practiced, if all remedies, at least all active remedies,—especially drugs, were abandoned."

Again he says: "The history of medicine is but a history of perpetual changes in the opinions and practices of its professors respecting the very same subject—the nature and treatment of disease."

Further on, in enumerating the successive changes and contradictory views and treatment for the same disease, he says, "alas! as often for the worse as for the better," also "that in proportion to the cures and deaths, the number has remained

nearly the same." He adds: "What difference of opinion! What an array of alleged facts directly at variance with each other! What contradictions! What opposite results of a like experience! What ups and downs! What glorification of this remedy—what confidence now, what despair anon, in encountering the same disease with the very same weapon! What horror and intolerance at one time of the very opinion and practice which previously and subsequently we cherished and admired. Things have arrived at such a pitch that they cannot be worse, *they must mend or end!*"

Will you sustain the opinion of this talented gentleman of your own school? Does not your experience and want of success in practice compel you to acknowledge the truthfulness of this distinguished disciple of *Æsculapius*? In Hufeland's journal we find the following remarks from an opponent of Homeopathy by Professor Widekind: "In our present mixed practice, we may get gray, and if God please, white hair, but never experience. If, however, Homeopathy induces us to give less medicine, to change it less frequently, we may some day, with careful observation, glory in a medical experience; which we unhappily cannot do at present."

What an acknowledgment! How deeply should it crimson the faces of such practitioners as are enumerated on the 14th and 15th pages of this letter. Is it not equivalent to uttering an eternal protest to every principle of Allopathic medication? Yet, sir, you boast of a practice that the learned professors of your own school are forced humbly to acknowledge does more harm than good. Dr. Paris, speaking of the uncertainty of Allopathic practice in consequence of the miserable principle of prescribing at random, with half a dozen remedies in the same dose, says: "The file of every apothecary would furnish a volume of instances where the ingre-

dients of the prescription were fighting each other in the dark." A few conscientious Allopathists have given their testimony in rather stronger language than that already quoted. Thus the talented Dr. Zimmerman says: "In reviewing the twenty-six years I have practiced medicine, at times I am nearly driven to madness and despair over the lamentable fate that has befallen so many of my patients. Could I call back to life the peaceful dead, and see them in the same situation they were in when I first prescribed, I verily believe I should leave them to God's providence, with a conviction that they would be better off without my interference than with."

How differently men of thoughtful and reflecting minds speak in relation to Allopathic practice, from yourself. One, under a conscientious knowledge of the power his remedies have over the lives of his patients, feels the burden of responsibility so heavily that after twenty-six years' practice he could give utterance to such deep emotions of soul that he declares "if he had left his patients to God's providence they would have been better off than with his interference." You, however, appear to think and act as Dr. Gatling did when he lost three out of every four of his patients. "The fault," said he, "is not in me, or in Allopathy, but God has seen fit to withhold his blessings on account of the sins of the people in this place." May be you can make the thirteen families in which you lost thirteen patients in less than nine weeks believe the same thing. And probably you can make Mr. Fisk believe you did a good job in surgery when he discovered, at the close of three months, that the fractured extremities of the *femur* had not united, and then, on a second effort, that the crooked limb was straight, and although three inches shorter, that it was just as good as if it were as long

as the other, and that there was no need of his going to Janesville to have it re-broken and set again. But, Doctor, you could make us believe all that, easier than to believe your practice does not help to hasten the numerous patients you lose to a premature grave.

We certainly think the public would be better off if you would take three or four good medical journals, and in the room of spending whole days at playing checkers and pitching quoits, devote those leisure hours to enriching your mind with useful knowledge, so that you would be able to more successfully administer to the necessities of an afflicted people. This course would enable you to furnish your patients with more science in theory and practice, and fewer hisfalutin codfish medical expressions.

Dr. Hufeland, in giving his views in relation to Allopathic practice, says: "My opinion is that more harm than good is done by physicians, and I am convinced that had I left my patients to nature instead of prescribing drugs to them, more would have been saved." In all candor, Doctor, don't you believe the same thing in relation to your last sixteen years' practice? You doubtless remember what a time Col. Crocket had with an old bear, in one of his hunting excursions. When the Col. pitched his tent on the bear's hunting ground she politely informed him that he was an intruder, and must leave. "But," said the Col., "you are accused of killing the pet lambs, and all the old fat wethers in this town-ship; is that so?" "Well," said the bear, "you see I have some bulk, and a pretty good den, and that shows business, but it remains for them to prove that I kill the sheep." Comment is unnecessary.

The lamented Dr. Gibson, in a personal chat upon the merits of the two rival systems, made the following admissions:

"You know," said he, "I use but very little medicine. I learned this from two sources; one was from you Homeopaths, whom I saw were curing more patients than I but the principle consideration was the north and east grave yards, where are scores of my sleeping dead." Referring to his rival practitioner, Dr. Downer, now of San Francisco, California, he added, "and that young man will regret, alas, too late, over the graves of three score and ten patients before sad experience will tell him he is killing more than he cures." Such has been the fatality following the practice of all young Allopathic graduates that it has passed into a proverb which really experience sanctions as truth, that "he has got one grave yard to fill before he learns to practice medicine." Dr. Smith gives us a bit of testimony in relation to Allopathy which should be handed down to future generations in memory of a truthful speaking man. He says "the great success of quacks in England has been altogether owing to the real quackery of the regular physicians." Dr. Comb, who has a world-wide fame, says: "Medicine, as often practiced by men of undoubted respectability, is made so much of a mystery, and is so nearly allied, if not identified, with quackery, that it would puzzle a rational looker on to tell the one from the other." We presume, however, that you never practice deceptively—that you are a real *moire antique* *simon-pure* Allopathist, and never deceive; therefore the remarks of these distinguished gentlemen will have no bearing upon you. It is pretty evident, however, that they are suitable for one or the other of the two classes of physicians referred to on page 15.

The celebrated Dr. Bichat, after many years of practice and deep study, says: "Oh, the vagueness and uncertainty of our science! It presents at this day an incoherent assemblage



of incoherent opinions. It is perhaps of all the physiological sciences that which best shows the caprice of the human mind. What do I say? It is not a science for a methodical mind,—it is a shapeless assemblage of incoherent ideas, of observation often purely of deceptive remedies, and of formulas as fantastically conceived as they are tediously arranged.”

Where do you suppose you and your practice would be if you had the honesty of heart, the decision of character, to acknowledge facts just as they do actually exist between you and the remedies you so often prescribe? The authors we have quoted are, and have been, the glory of the Allopathic profession, yet they frankly utter the most scathing denunciations against this jargon practice. Yet we hear you boast of the great improvements being made in the Allopathic practice; of this new medicine, or that new medicine. We recently called upon one of the gentlemen who was boasting of such rapid progress in the healing art among the Allopathists. When interrogated, the only thing he was capable of bringing forward was that “they didn’t bleed in inflammatory diseases, did not salivate, and used but little medicine.” Thank God for all this; but we ask to whom are the people indebted for this improvement but the Homeopathist? Allopathists are *forced* there, and will soon be forced to abandon the whole paraphernalia of their empirical practice.

Doubtless it was a want of confidence in the practice of medicine that prompted Dr. Routh, of London, England, to say that “more remarkable cures had been made by bread pills in the Allopathic profession than by medicine.” Dr. Boorhaave was doubtless led into the same train of reflection when with one dash of his pen he has branded with eternal infamy at least four classes enumerated above in the ranks of Allopathy. He says: “If we compare the good which half

a dozen true disciples of Æsculapius have done since their art began, with the evils the immense number of doctors have inflicted upon mankind, we must be satisfied that *it would have been infinitely better if medical men had never existed.*"

The authors we quote were all independent thinkers, who read and compared facts with the theory of the Allopathic system, and being philanthropists, spoke the truth as they felt the load of guilt pressing upon their shoulders.

Now sir, you know your last hold upon the people for the maintenance of a practice is to make them believe there are great improvements in the science of medicine, that new discoveries have been made, and that new improvements are being introduced,—in fact, that a host of new things are being ushered into the profession that enables your school to out-rival all others in this respect ; that all others are but mere hangers on to the regular practice. The same course is pursued by the great mass of professional men in your school. It appears, however, that the talented Dr. Forbes, F. R. S., entertained different views, for he emphatically declares that "the science of medicine as now existing *cannot be made worse.*" Dr. Hooker's definition of Allopathy corroborates this view, although given from different motives. For if it embraces all theories, all modes, all systems and all practices of all regular physicians, (Homeopathy excepted) it certainly is so "very diversified in its combination" that it sweeps by the board the vegetable, mineral and animal kingdoms of earth, and must contain so much that it cannot be made worse.

From the quotations already made, it is evident your system embraces nothing definite or certain, but everything in general, in theory and practice, whether derived from heathen idolaters, old wives, quacks, or college formulas.

We will also introduce the testimony of the world famed

Dr. Johnston. Said he, "I declare it to be my most conscientious opinion that if there were not a single physician, or surgeon, or apothecary, or man-midwife, or chemist, or druggist, or drug in the world, there would be less mortality among mankind than there is now." If Dr. Johnston had not felt, forcibly, an utter want of confidence in the practice of medicine, would he have made this broad and sweeping assertion against everything that in any way contributes its share of the misery manifested in those who are so unfortunate as to fall victims to its withering blast? What motive aside from an honest conviction of its injurious influence upon the life, health, and constitution of man, could have prompted this unmistakable language?

Dr. Waterhouse says: "Oh, the uncertainty of our system of medication! at best mere guess work of vague uncertainties. As for merit, it has none." You doubtless feel different when you are so zealously upholding its merits and traducing Homeopathy? Dr. Jackson says, "When shall we ever get to a solid bottom? Shall we ever find fixed laws and principles to guide us in the selection of our remedies? Or must we be forever doomed to hang our heads, *to guess, to hope, to suspect, to try and try only?*" And Dr. Rush, we think it is, says, "Our system of medication is in the highest degree uncertain, except that we have already destroyed more lives than war, pestilence and famine combined." Dr. Frank says: "The medical police is restricted to public business, and directed against contagion, epidemics, quacks, etc. But it does not stop to consider that thousands are slaughtered in the quiet sick room. Government should at once either banish medical men, and their art, or they should take proper measures that the lives of people may be safer than at present, when they look far less after the practice of this danger-

ous art and the murders committed in it, than after the lowest trade."

In the light of such testimony we must sanction the assertion made by Dr. Routh, that the greatest cures of Allopathists were performed by bread-pills," and for the benefit of your patients we earnestly recommend you to adopt the same practice. You would then have the consciousness that you were not injuring them, which is more than you have now, when you review the history of your past practice, or visit the cemetery.

Dr. Rider says: "More infantile subjects are yearly destroyed by the mortar and pestle, than in one day fell victims to the Herodian massacre." Sir Ashley Cooper adds the following bit of testimony, viz: "The science of medicine was founded on conjecture and 'improved by murder.'" Dr. Bailey says: "I am well persuaded in my own mind and I doubt not that every practitioner who will tell what he honestly thinks, is also, that seven-tenths of all the deaths among mankind in the more civilized and enlightened nations, are not from natural disease, but from the excessive use of medicines, injudiciously administered." Dr. Moore says, "I verily believe that, whilst I have been instrumental in saving the lives of many of my fellow men, I fear more have died from over medication than I have saved." Dr. Kirsey says: "In most cases the proverb is true that the remedy is worse than the disease, or the doctor is more dangerous than the disease." Dr. Addison says: "If we look into the profession of medicine we shall find a most formidable body of men; the sight of them is enough to make a man serious, for we may lay it down as a rule that when a nation abounds in physicians, it grows thin in people." When Surgeon Hammond prohibited the use of mercury in the

army he is reported to have added that "in the hands of the profession it killed more than southern bullets." Dr. Dickson says: "So far as my experience in medical matters goes, few people are permitted to die of disease—the orthodox fashion is to die of the doctor." Dr. Bailee declares he has no faith whatever in medicine. Dr. Brown testifies that he wasted twenty years in learning, teaching, and diligently scrutinizing every department of medicine. What an admission—wasted twenty years! Dr. Leeson says there are 410 preparations in the *Pharmacopœia* of the Royal College of Physicians, and of these 400 are of little or no value, and that the remaining ten might have assisted him in reducing at one time and another causes occurring in every department of his practice. No wonder Dr. Brown considered twenty years of his life wasted!

But, sir, time and space prevent us from following these quotations further. Enough proof has been produced, from the most learned and talented authors of your own school, to show that as far as the Allopathic practice is concerned, "it is neither one thing nor the other" when brought to the anvil of truth and tested in the light of science. But you may ask what have these numerous quotations to do with the subject under discussion? We answer that we first wished to show from your own authors that the entire system of Allopathic therapeutics, and nearly the whole of your *Materia Medica*, are now looked upon by men of science as destitute of all virtue, and were actually doing the world vastly more harm than good, and that they multiplied disease, increased pain and suffering, shortened life, and multiplied the number of the dead. *This we have effectually done.* It is therefore evident that to administer remedies on the Allopathic principle will not cure disease, but on the contrary de-



stroys life in the room of saving. It now only remains for us to show that minute doses will cure, and having done this, we will have sustained Homeopathy. And if we have not crushed Allopathy, we have held it up to the gaze of an outraged and doctor-ridden public.

Our first argument shall be derived from the writings of Dr. Gardner, an opponent of Homeopathy. That gentleman, speaking of his own practice, says: "It is of great importance to show the total inefficiency of Allopathy in the treatment of scarlet fever on the one hand, and the successful results of Homeopathy on the other. In the course of many years' experience I have had many times reason to feel deeply the want of a remedy against scarlet fever. It will, I suppose, be admitted by all, that this disease is the result of a specific poison, and that the general principles of treatment as applied to other fevers, whether arising from aerial poison or other causes, often disappoint us in scarlet fever. During the prevalence of this epidemic at certain seasons, a more malignant character seems impressed on the disease. Our *best* means fail, and our patient dies, apparently wholly unaffected (for *good*) by our treatment. Such, at least, has been my experience. I have seen whole families swept off in spite of every effort and the united counsel of many practitioners." This same Dr. Gardner having at a later period been induced to try belladonna, a Homeopathic remedy, in this disease, thus relates his experience with it: "Without reckoning slight cases of scarlet fever and sore throat, I have treated thirty cases with symptoms more or less grave, by means of belladonna. In very many of these I should, formerly, have entertained no hope of seeing the patient pass through the attack, the appearance of the disease being marked by a malignant aspect. I need not enumerate the peculiar symptoms

which characterize fatal scarlet fever—they are well known to every practitioner. In the absence of belladonna, I have watched with great anxiety those fatal tokens; they allow little room for our anticipation being negative; but with the belladonna I have not yet met with a fatal case.”

Dr. Gardner is well known to the Allopathic profession, and this acknowledgment in favour of our so-called specific should be a heavy testimony in favor of our principles, for the provings of belladonna upon the healthy subject, as well as in thousands of cases by the bed-side of the sick, have stamped it with distinguished merit in the treatment of scarlet fever simplex.

You may object to our introducing this testimony from Dr. Gardner in favor of attenuated doses because he does not relate the quantity given at the bed side. But as before remarked, Homeopathy is a principle, not a dose. Unlike Dr. Hooker's definition of Allopathy, Homeopathy is one law, one principle, one thing, and whether the remedy be the crude drug, the alkaloid, the mother tincture, the third or thirteenth attenuation, when exhibited upon the great fundamental principle of relationship and similitude, it is Homeopathic and nothing else, and if it is not given upon this law of relationship it becomes Allopathic, and thus can be classed with that school, which does not claim to be one thing, one mode, one system, but includes everything in general and nothing in particular, and is very diversified in its relation. Therefore, if Dr. Gardner was induced to try this remedy through the influence of Homeopathy, to them he is indebted for his success in the last years of his practice. Remember, when prescribing Allopathically he “saw his patient sink and die, wholly unaffected (for *good*) by his treatment.” Whether Dr. Gardner used the third decimal attenuation or

dropped doses of the mother tincture in a glass of water, the prescription was according to the law of dependence taught by Homeopathy. Most of our school use this remedy in the third decimal attenuation, and as we seldom lose a case of scarlet fever it is a fair conclusion that infinitesimal doses in our hands do cure scarlatina or scarlet fever, other remedies following as indicated.

Again. The Homeopathist never prescribes with the object of producing any of the poisonous artificial effects of the drug; and as the dose is no part or parcel of the law of our school, but the principles which prompt its administration are, therefore his only object is to give such a remedy, in such a quantity, as will act on the diseased part, and with sufficient power to bring about a healthy action or re-action in the diseased organ. He also claims to continue the use of the remedy at such intervals as shall maintain this re-action sufficiently long to eradicate the disease. And as we have before shown that in disease the parts affected are far more sensitive and more easily impressed than in health, it is again conclusive evidence that by the use of these minute doses we do cure our patients.

Again, the law of dependence as existing between quantity and quantity affords us an additional proof of the curative power of infinitesimal doses. This quantity is the great bone of contention, over which all Allopathists wrangle. In one case it is too small to amount to anything, and should be met with scorn, ridicule and contempt. Should that argument fail to produce the desired result of biasing the mind of the patient, the other extreme is resorted to, and our remedial agents are represented as the most deadly poisons, and should be feared and shunned on account of their deleterious effects. It has come to such a pass in your practice that you are forced

to both extremes, or any and all means, to maintain a professional business, and such is your fear of our success as a Homeopathist, that you would rather a patient would die under Allopathic treatment than to pass into the hands of a Homeopathist and be cured. You dare not deny this!

Now what are the facts in relation to quantity? Is it not according to all law and all principles of science, that power must be balanced by power, weight by weight, or quantity by quantity? not bulk by quantity, but *quantity by quantity*. What quantity of any disease is it which gives us the class of excruciating symptoms we so often witness in a case of neuralgia? Suppose you have a case of neuralgia of the cœliac-plexus: What intense agony! What suffering! What contortions, too frightful to behold! Pray, sir, what is the quantity of the disease which produces these strange phenomena, manifested only through symptoms? Is it not according to the teachings of philosophy, that quantity is equaled by quantity, power by power, and weight by weight? Is it therefore, reasonable to suppose that, inasmuch as the quantity of the disease present is minute and infinitesimal, that this quantity must be subdued by such gross, ponderable material as is manifested in the crude drugs so grossly administered by Allopathists, or shall we combat these minute molecules which produce these disturbances with minute particles of our finely prepared, pure and wholesome preparations. Reasoning again from analogy, we have a strong, clear and pointed argument in favor of combatting disease with quantities similar in quantity, or doses very minute indeed. You must admit we use quantity, for quantity is the only word that expresses the meaning. This quantity, be it ever so small, is equal to the quantity manifested in disease; therefore if quantity is balanced by quantity, power by power, weight by

weight, our argument is clear that doses should be small when administered to cure disease.

Although we have given so many unmistakable proofs in favor of exhibiting these minute quantities, yet you claim they possess no power or efficacy over disease, and coolly say our patients would have done just as well without our assistance as with. This is saying more for our practice than we can say for Allopathy, for we think from personal observation, the experience we have had in treating those patients which have been victimized by old school doctors, and the testimony from your own authors, warrant us in withholding from you the merit you so readily give us ; for, in all candor, we do believe that nine out of ten are made radically worse in the long run by the use of your medication.

Once more, suppose we have twenty men, more or less, and we allow ten of them to inflate the lungs with sulphurated hydrogen or carbonic acid gas, and they all die ; whereas the other half inhaled ether and were not injured ; would you have any hesitation, if you were empaneled as one of the jury in a post mortem examination, in pronouncing that they all came to their deaths by inflating the lungs with the gas ? Most certainly not. Again, suppose that thirty patients had went into a dentist's office, each to get one or more teeth extracted. They all took chloroform. One died, and twenty-nine received no injury. Would you hesitate to say that the unfortunate one came to his death by the use of chloroform ? The case is too clear to admit of argument. Let us follow this a little further. Suppose one hundred persons had inhaled carbonic acid gas at the same time, and one or five had died ; would you have any hesitation in saying that those who died, died from the effects of the gas ? This case is also too clear to admit of argument. Reverse the case,



and suppose ninety-nine had died and one escaped uninjured—the verdict would still be the same: “Death from inhaling carbonic acid gas.” Now, in the light of this illustration, we will introduce a Homeopathic physician during an epidemic of scarlet fever, and thirty-nine out of every forty cases recover, whereas, under Allopathic treatment, according to the statement of Dr. Gardner, your best remedies fail, and the patients die, unaided by your treatment, whole families being swept off in spite of every effort and the united skill of many practitioners. Would you not consider this about as strong proof as could be produced to sustain the efficacy of our minute doses? For the first, second or third decimal attenuations are in quantity exceedingly small. But we hear you again argue, “they would have done just as well without your aid as with?” What, then, must be the weight and force of this argument against your practice, when “whole families are swept off in spite of every effort, and the united counsel of many practitioners,” and when “the patients sicken and die, unaided by your remedies.” But let the testimony of Dr. Gardner solve the problem of our infinitesimal doses, when he says that without reckoning slight cases, he had treated thirty cases of scarlet fever, many of them with grave and severe symptoms, by means of our specific, belladonna, and had not lost a case. Here is an unlimited difference in favor of Homeopathy, as shown from the testimony of a distinguished member of your own school.

His testimony stands thus :

TREATED HOMEOPATHICALLY.

30 cases.  
All cured.  
Patients seldom die.

TREATED ALLOPATHICALLY.

30 cases. All die.  
Whole families are swept off  
in spite of the united efforts and  
counsel of many prescribers.

Suppose we reversed this statement, and statistics showed that we lost not thirty, but ten cases to your one: don't you think you would have pretty good evidence to establish the superiority of your practice over ours? We rather think it would be placed in large letters over the door of every Allopathist in the community that Homeopathy was a grand failure. In the loss of but one patient in thirteen months, there was ten times as much talk in the community by you and the lovers of Old Physic, than there was over the fifty-four that died under the treatment of Allopathy during last year. Really, one would have supposed, had he heard the remarks, that death under Allopathic practice was a thing unknown. Since that time something over twenty persons have died in and around Delavan, under Allopathic practice, and not one under the practice of Homeopathy. Thirteen of these were Dr. J. B. HEMINWAY's patients. Yet your great heart throbbed with deep emotion to think that people would trust their lives in our hands, and tears flowed freely.

In its proper place we shall show that under Homeopathic practice the average mortality is from 20 to 30, and in many instances even 45 or 50 per cent. less than under Allopathic practice. Yet, amidst the fountain of tears and the throbbing emotions of your heart for the dupes of the "Homeopathic quack" in this place, you fail to see any efficacy in this law of dependence between disease and remedies, or the efficacy of our minute doses, when the mortality last year was 2,000 per cent. against you, and so far this year 1300 per cent., i. e., last year you lost twenty patients to our one, and this year up to date of writing thirteen to one. Facts are stubborn things to contend against, nevertheless with these before you and the people, you and your friends are doing your utmost to crush out the interests of Homeopathy in this place,

and for no other reason than that we lose less patients than any Allopathist, with equally as good a practice, and that we try to teach that the science of medicine should be reduced to a principle as capable of demonstration as a problem in mathematics, and in perfect keeping with authenticated and well established laws. In this argument we have combined facts with analogy—facts drawn from the pages of Allopathic authors, which should make it doubly strong, at least in your mind, for it is according to the usages of all law that if the plaintiff sustain his case by the defendant's own witnesses, the plaintiff's case will in the same ratio become the stronger, and *vice versa*. This we have done from the beginning of this letter to the present time. We have not only introduced Allopathic authors as corroborating testimony, but used them as direct evidence against the infamy of their own school. In the light and strength of the testimony introduced, we think you must find yourself in a very uncomfortable condition. For your sake we would be glad to leave you a little reflection before we proceed further, but for the good of the public and the cause of Homeopathy, we must reason a little farther upon the power and efficacy of imponderable agents and Homeopathic specifics, by referring to your treatment of scarlet fever in this place during the months of February and March. When this fever first made its appearance we prepared vials of belladonna and distributed them among families where we had prescribed, knowing it to be a preventive to scarlet fever simplex, but not scarlet fever maligna. The same course was soon after followed by members of your own school, and we are credibly informed that Dr. BRIGGS (Allopathist) introduced the remedy into his own family, as well as recommending and selling it to others for the same purpose. As far as we have learned, in no instance

did this disease reach a family where this Homeopathic specific was introduced, excepting in Elder HALTEMAN's, and we handed him a vial the very day you were called to attend his children. We ask, why you at once recommended and continued the use of this remedy upon the law of Homeopathy, if those principles are defective? Why did you not at once condemn the use of aconite and belladonna, and adopt the regular Allopathic practice? We have a standard Allopathic author—Mendenhall, published 1866—which says: "There can be no general directions given, applicable in all cases. We must be guided by general principles."

In the *simple variety*, such as Elder HALTEMAN's children had, he says, "confinement to bed, a gentle aperient, abstinence from stimulating diet, sponging the body when hot, will be all that is usually demanded."

"In the *anginose variety*, when the fever is active, the pulse full and hard, bloodletting may become proper, but should be used with caution; purgatives of calomel and rhubarb, castor oil, etc., leeches to the throat, cool air, sponging with tepid water, chlorine internally, penciling the throat internally with the nitrate of silver, capsicum gargles, revulsive applications to the throat, &c." This "&c." we presume means everything else in the 410 formulas recommended by the regular gentlemen. This probably is the variety which the third child had in the family referred to, and this is the regular Allopathic practice. Now sir, how much of this was used by you in this case? Should you say it was the third variety, *scarlatina maligna*, and follow your authors, you would have to continue the same treatment, for the same author says: "The local means used should be the same as in the preceding variety," but recommends to go light on cathartics. But should you say it is the second variety, we ask

how much Allopathic treatment entered into the case during your attendance ! Did you use calomel for cathartics ? did you apply leeches to the throat ? did you bleed the little girl ? did you use blisters, or apply nitrate of silver to the throat ? No ! you dare not do it in the family of an intelligent man like Elder HALTEMANN. You knew also that they were favorable to the system of Homeopathy, and called for us before going for you, therefore you *gave down*, like a good old bossy, hung out Homeopathic colors, used aconite and belladonna, and saved the children. We thank heaven for it. Go on in such acts of mercy. Get a Homeopathic *Materia Medica* and study this law of dependence between disease and remedies, and you will soon become convinced of their efficacy when exhibited in minute doses. Whether those unfortunate children who lately departed life so soon after the attack of this fever were subjected to the Allopathic treatment recommended above, or whether aconite and belladonna were employed, we know not. Those in attendance must answer.

Doctor, let me ask you if you do not think the prompt use of belladonna stayed the ravages of this disease in Delavan ? It certainly made its appearance with threatening and forbidding aspects, but soon disappeared. Compare the benefit derived from this Homeopathic specific, which your own authors now laud with such high commendations, by the side of Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup, which is reputed to destroy thousands of children annually, and we think unless wilfully blind and stubborn you will say, away with this Allopathic trash, and give us Homeopathic remedies. We assure you the same happy results follow their use on the one hand, and as much evil from many other empiric nostrums given in your practice, on the other. Lest we be misunderstood, let us inform you that Homeopaths have never claimed belladonna.



as a specific in malignant scarlet fever. Neither do we claim that we can cure all our cases. Should we succeed in saving two out of every three, it is just that many more than can be saved by Allopathy, for we have never met a case of real malignant scarlet fever cured by an Allopathist, when the case was treated according to the teachings of that school. In the few cases where they have been successful, it was due to Homeopathic treatment.

But in simple, uncomplicated scarlet fever, although it be very severe, we do claim belladonna to be a *sovereign remedy*. In our practice the past year we have had only eight cases of malignant scarlet fever. One of these, after a hard contest of eight days, quietly—no, in life's hardest struggles sank to rest. The other, after vacillating between life and death for eighteen days, finally recovered. We think we have had our share of this practice, and can report only eight cases of malignant scarlet fever. Do you think, under your Allopathic treatment, that darling little babe could have baffled disease eight days? and that the other could have lived eighteen days, and finally recovered? We rather think not; several have died under Allopathic treatment this winter in from thirty-six to seventy-two hours.

You doubtless will admit the deleterious effects of those infinitesimal particles of miasmata which become disintegrated from the vegetable kingdom in consequence of decomposition, and which pervade the atmosphere for miles in circumference, so that a person whose system is in such a condition as to be impressed by their influence will get a quantity of such magnitude as to produce the most severe attacks of intermittent fever. Are these attenuations capable of being reduced to any chemical test? Can they be analyzed by any known law? Can you, with your best Allopathic arithmetic—even that used

by Profs. Simpson, Palmer, Hooker, and Forbes—demonstrate their size? Are not those attenuations of nature fully equal to any Homeopathic dose,—even Hahnemann's reputed 30th, of sepia, calcarae or sulphur? Or, in other words, is not the quantity of medicine exhibited by any Homeopathist, at any time, and under all circumstances, fully equal in quantity to the particles of miasmata which produce sickness, suffering, and death? Reasoning again from analogy, you must deny the influence of these minute, incomprehensible “quack” or “humbug” doses of nature on the system, or admit that the system is capable of being impressed by imponderable agents. And if you have proof to sustain you in the opinion that this miasma will produce intermittent or other fevers because you have seen one thousand persons laid low on beds of sickness and a few of them die, in consequence of this miasmatic influence, so in like manner we can prove the curative power of infinitesimal doses over disease, for we have seen a thousand cured by their influence, although a few have died.

We ask you sir, to gather the wise men, the close reasoners, those with extraordinary mathematical powers, the soothsayers and astrologers, the intelligent and scientific men in your school, as well as your chemists, and with the whole craft combined, with J. B. HEMINWAY, M. D., of Delavan, Wisconsin, can you give us in tangible form a comprehensible idea of the amount of miasma, small-pox, scarlet fever, or cholera, capable of infecting a whole city and laying in death thousands of its inhabitants?

Suppose that we turn materialist, and absolutely call in question the judgment of your close reasoning, highly educated scientific men and mathematicians, because they cannot give us in tangible form the bulk, size, weight and dimensions of a dose of miasmata, small pox, measles, scarlet fever,

etc., and absolutely say they do not exist, although we see abundant proofs of their effects upon the organism. And we cry, away with your infinitesimal particles of miasmata, of scarlet fever, etc., and ask you to give us something in the form of disease capable of demonstration? Would not your close reasoning gentlemen and even yourself consider us so far beneath the race of men possessing common sense that you would greatly doubt the justice of God in calling us to an account in judgment for a want of intellectual perception?

Reasoning from demonstrated facts in relation to the curative power of our doses, we can place you and all those who turn materialists and deny the efficacy of the Homeopathic dose, in the same class, for you also turn materialist and doubt their influence because you cannot weigh them on Allopathic scales, or chemically analyze their constituent parts. Should you see ten persons out of a hundred die of small-pox, you would say that small-pox killed the patients. Have you seen the disease? If not, how do you know they died of this malady? You say you witnessed their sufferings, saw the effect manifested in symptoms, and in death. Again, you lose thirty cases out of a hundred, a fair average under Allopathic practice, in typhoid fever. You at once say, "they died of typhoid fever." Have you seen the disease? If not, how can you so confidently say they died of the fever? Or have you only witnessed the effects of an unseen influence manifesting itself in suffering and death? Fifty per cent. of your patients with diphtheria die. You at once attribute their death to that influence. We ask again, how do you know that? Have you seen the disease, or analyzed its constituent parts, weighed it on scales, or can you give us its demonstration? Oh, no, you can only say you have a right to judge from the manifestation of results, viz: symptoms present and death the

result. We grant that your conclusions are just, and that you have a right to judge of causes from their effects, and effects from causes. Upon this same ground of reasoning we introduce the curative relationship of our infinitesimal doses, and for your satisfaction will acknowledge that they cannot be chemically analyzed, arithmetically demonstrated, or Allopathically weighed, and like disease, must be judged by results. In applying this argument we will present one hundred cases of small-pox; experience justifies us in the statement that at least 20 per cent. of the hospital cases die under Allopathic treatment, whereas only about 5 per cent. die under Hhomeopathic treatment, a difference of 15 per cent.

In scarlet fever, statistics show a difference in favor of Hhomeopathy of 25 per cent.; in diphtheria a difference in favor of our system of 30 per cent.; in inflammation of the lungs about 23 per cent. Now, sir, if we have a right to judge of causes from their results, and from results back to causes, have we not the strongest proof which can be produced in favor of treating disease with our minute doses? Statistics from various parts of the world, which we shall presently introduce, show that we save at least 20 per cent. more of our patients than does the Allopathist. Therefore, reasoning not only from comparison, but from results back to causes derived from practice as shown from authenticated reports, the argument is unanswerable,

First, That the Homeopathist, by the use of his minute doses, does save more than the Allopathist with his crude drugs; or—

Second, That the Hhomeopathic system is nothing but to let nature cure; or—

Third, That if nature cures twenty per cent. more patients than the system of Allopathy, then that system destroys twenty per cent. of its patients' lives.

Should you take the first position you acknowledge Homeopathy the greatest blessing to the afflicted people heretofore known.

Should you admit the second proposition, you acknowledge nature and Homeopathy both superior to Allopathy.

Should you take the third proposition, you admit yours to be a life destroying system, ultimating in wide spread havoc of disease and death. All of which we readily believe.

We think enough has been given to convince at least those halting between two opinions, that the Homeopathic system is superior to Allopathy, and is, by its intrinsic worth and merit entitled to the consideration it is receiving from the more refined, enlightened, and scientific part of community. As a final argument we must now refer you to the

#### RELATIVE SUCCESS OF THE TWO SYSTEMS IN THE TREATMENT OF EPIDEMICS.

You doubtless remember that during the prevalence of cholera, the Homeopathist gained great popularity over Allopathy on account of his superior skill in treating that dreadful scourge. Knowing this to be so, and anxious that the facts should come before the people, the board of directors of the Homeopathic hospital, London, invited the board of health to come and investigate the facts in relation to the case, and witness the course of treatment and the results.

Dr. MacLaughlan, being medical inspector of the board of health, was appointed to visit the hospital, watch the cases, mode of treatment, and report the results of his investigation. We can do no better than to quote from his own writing to show the influence of this investigation on his mind in relation to the success of our practice and the utility of exhibiting remedies in the higher attenuations in this most fearful disease. You must bear in mind while reading his



statement that he was a vindictive enemy of Homeopathy, and must have given his report partially. "You are aware," he says, "that I went into your hospitals prepossessed against the Homeopathic system, and that you had in me in your camp an enemy rather than a friend, and that I must therefore have seen cogent reason there the first day I went, to come away so favorably disposed as to advise a friend to send a subscription to your charitable fund, and I need not tell you that I have taken some pains to make myself acquainted with the rise, progress and medical treatment in cholera, and that I claim for myself some right to be able to recognize the disease, and to know something of what the treatment ought to be, and that there be, therefore, no misapprehension about the cases I saw in your hospital, I will add that all I saw were true cases of cholera, in the various stages of the disease, and that I saw several cases which did well under your treatment which *I have no hesitation in saying would have sunk under any other.* In conclusion I must repeat what I have already told you, and what I have told every one with whom I have conversed, that although an Allopathist by principle, education and practice, yet, was it the will of Providence to afflict me with cholera, and to deprive me of the power of prescribing for myself, I would rather be in the hands of a Homeopathic than an Allopathic adviser."

Now, sir, what do you think of the testimony of such an eminent and distinguished Allopathist as Dr. MacLaughlin, in favor of the Homeopathic system of medication in cases of cholera? He acknowledges he was an open enemy to our practice, nevertheless, after remaining long enough to witness the results of our treatment openly confesses that *he would rather be in the hands of a Homeopathic than an Allopathic adviser* if it should please Providence to afflict him with

cholera." Doubtless he spoke as he felt, and when he, or any other person, becomes fully aware of the efficacy of Homeopathic treatment, they will not only come to the same conclusion but actually adopt it in theory and practice, unless self interest and prejudice should prompt them to do otherwise, as we have reason to believe Allopathists would do.

We now call your attention to the following tables, extracts from a collective report of seven European Homeopathic hospitals as found in the *North American Journal of Homeopathy*, Vol. II, Page 151.

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
Apoplexy, . . . . .	21	11	6	4
Bleeding from the Lungs, . . . . .	138	112	9	17
Bleeding from the Stomach, . . . . .	11	10	0	1
Bleeding from the Womb, . . . . .	41	40	0	1
Burns and Scalds, . . . . .	53	50	0	3
Catarrh of the Chest, Acute, . . . . .	161	158	0	3
Cough, Hooping, . . . . .	41	34	0	7
Cholera, . . . . .	59	55	4	0
Convulsions, . . . . .	56	40	0	16
Cramping of Stomach, . . . . .	129	121	1	7
Croup, . . . . .	6	6	0	0
Diarrhea, . . . . .	310	255	3	52
Dysentery . . . . .	98	91	7	0
Erysipelas of the Face and Head, . . . . .	349	337	3	9
Erysipelas of the Feet and Legs, . . . . .	68	64	0	4
Enlargement of the Liver, . . . . .	3	3	0	0

*Table—Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
FEVER—Catarrhal, . . . . .	304	294	4	6
Inflammatory, . . . . .	58	53	2	3
Bilious and Gastric, . . . . .	1010	991	9	10
Brain, . . . . .	7	6	1	0
Typhus, severe, . . . . .	1895	1437	289	169
Mild and Nervous, . . . . .	231	210	4	17
Continued, . . . . .	294	279	10	5
Intermittent, . . . . .	1071	972	5	94
Rheumatic, . . . . .	399	362	0	37
Scarlet, Simple and Maligna, . .	102	94	3	5
Gout, Acute and Chronic, . . . .	319	293	5	21
INFLAMMATION OF THE—Joints, Acute, . .	390	366	6	18
Bladder, . . . . .	8	7	0	1
Brain, . . . . .	54	25	3	26
Air Tubes, . . . . .	56	40	1	15
Bowels & Per'm . . . . .	211	191	13	7
Kidneys, . . . . .	4	3	0	1
Liver, . . . . .	45	33	0	12
Lungs, . . . . .	710	629	45	36
Pleura, . . . . .	371	351	5	15
Spinal Marrow, . . . . .	14	13	0	1
Spleen, . . . . .	9	8	0	1
Testicles, . . . . .	10	10	0	0
Throat, . . . . .	596	583	1	12
Womb, . . . . .	15	11	0	4
Glands, . . . . .	24	24	0	0
Jaundice, . . . . .	96	85	0	11
Insanity, . . . . .	23	14	0	9
Injuries and Contusions, . . . . .	48	43	0	5
Concussion of the Brain, . . . . .	7	5	1	1
Lock Jaw, . . . . .	6	3	3	0
Measles, . . . . .	102	96	2	4

*Table—Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
Small Pox,.. . . . . .	211	195	6	10
Chicken Pox,.. . . . . .	141	140	1	0
St. Vitus' Dance,.. . . . . .	11	10	0	1
VOMITING—Bilious, . . . . .	8	8	0	0
Chronic,.. . . . . .	48	48	0	0

We will also add the authenticated Report of the Hail Orphan Asylum in New York, from 1842 to 1848 :

DISEASES.	Whole No. Ca- ses Admitted.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
Hooping Cough, . . . . .	65	65	0	0
Diarrhea, . . . . .	52	52	0	0
Dysentery,.. . . . . .	22	22	0	0
Croup,.. . . . . .	18	18	0	0
FEVER—Remittent,.. . . . . .	14	14	0	0
Gastric, . . . . .	7	7	0	0
Brain, . . . . .	4	4	0	0
Scarlet, . . . . .	11	10	1	0
Typhus,.. . . . . .	2	2	0	0
Continued, . . . . .	13	13	0	0
INFLAMMATION OF—Bowels,.. . . . . .	3	3	0	0
Lungs, . . . . .	7	7	0	0
Brain, . . . . .	1	0	1	0
Air Tubes, . . . . .	1	1	0	0
Stomach,.. . . . . .	2	2	0	0
Pleura, . . . . .	5	5	0	0

*Report—Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole No. Cases Admitted.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or under Treatment.
Quinsy, ... ..	7	7	0	0
Inflammation of the Eyes, Scrofulous and Catarrhal,....	255	248	0	7
Catarrh of the Lungs and Air Tubes,	92	92	0	0
Erysipelas,..	7	7	0	0
Concussion of the Brain,..	2	2	0	0
Hip Disease, .....	3	2	0	1
Consumption, ..	2	0	2	0
Colic, ....	2	2	0	0
Mumps, ....	3	3	0	0
Sciatica,....	1	1	0	0
Cholera, .....	2	2	0	0
Canker Sore Mouth,..	9	9	0	0
Scrofula,...	3	3	0	0
Scrofulous Abscesses,....	8	8	0	0
Eruptive Diseases, various kinds, ....	232	224	0	9
Rheumatism,....	2	2	0	
Jaundice, ..	6	6	0	
Convulsions,....	1	0	1	
Miasmus, wasting,...	3	3	0	
Total, ....	869	849	5	15

*Report of the same from 1848 to 1852:*

Typhus Fever.....	96	92	4	0
Diarrhea and Cholera.....	135	130	5	0
Dysentery.....	86	86	0	0
Mumps .....	16	16	0	0
Inflammation of the Eye, Scrofulous and Catarrhal .....	156	134	0	22
Hooping Cough.....	21	21	0	0
Eruptions .....	210	180	0	30



*Report—Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole No. Cases Admitted.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or under Treatment.
Cholera Asiatic .....	42	32	10	0
Abscesses, large.....	2	2	0	0
Measles.....	22	22	0	0
Erysipelas .....	5	5	0	0
Scarlet Fever.....	33	33	0	0
Quinsy .....	4	4	0	0
Sprains .....	4	4	0	0
Total.....	838	767	19	52

## REPORT

*Of the Home for the Friendless, in the City of New York,  
during the year 1851.*

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or under Treatment.
Canker Sore Mouth, ....	10	10	0	0
Dropsy, General,.....	1	1	0	0
Eruptions, Scald Heads,..	60	54	0	6
Itch, ....	5	5	0	0
Varioloid, ....	5	5	0	0
Small Pox, ....	1	1	0	0
FEVER—Catarrhal and Gastric,....	9	9	0	0
Remittent,..	1	1	0	0
Scarlet, ....	2	2	0	0
INFLAMMATION OF THE—Eyes, Scrofulous,	44	37	0	7
Eyelids, .	7	6	0	1

*Report—Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
INFLAMMATION OF THE—Lungs,...	6	6	0	0
Stomach, ....	2	2	0	0
Pleura,...	1	1	0	0
Tonsils, ....	6	6	0	0
Knee Joints, scrof'l's	1	0	0	1
Menses Suppressed,...	2	2	0	0
Mumps, ....	8	8	0	0
Otorrhea,...	2	2	0	0
Ulcers of Cornea, ....	6	4	0	2
Ulcers of Feet, Scrofulous,....	7	7	0	0
Other Diseases not specified, ....	22	22	0	0
Total, ....	208	191	0	17

How does this Homeopathic practice compare with yours? Out of 208 none are lost, whereas in your practice last year you lost something like 20. If we take the Hospital reports together we would not consider it as a fair average of Homeopathic practice; for the average of mortality is far greater than that which follows the labors of any thorough *Materia Medica* read Homeopathist. It also presents another thought, showing that the Homeopathists of Europe are less successful than those of this country. In 10,552 cases admitted, 9,421 are cured, 681 remained under treatment, and 450 died, an average of one to every  $23\frac{1}{2}$  patients. Whereas, in our American institutions we have 1905 cases treated, 1807 cured, 84 remaining under treatment, and 24 deaths, or 1 out of every 79 9-24ths. This want of similar results is doubtless owing in the main to the impoverished condition of the patients in European cities, compared with those in this country.

But the relative merits of the two systems will be more readily perceived when we compare Hospital reports of the Allopathist and Homeopathist side by side, introducing similar diseases and their results: "In 909 cases of inflammation of the lungs treated by Grisolle Briquet, Skoda in the Edinburgh Infirmary, two hundred and twelve died, which is nearly 23 per cent. In a Homeopathic Infirmary under the direction of Dr. Fleischmann, two hundred and ninety-nine cases of inflammation of the lungs were treated, with only nineteen deaths, or about 6 per cent. Here Allopathists lose about one in every four, Homeopathists one in every fifteen. We find also that out of one hundred and eleven cases of Pleuritis treated in the same Allopathic institution, fourteen died, or about one in every eight. Whereas out of two hundred and twenty four cases treated by Fleischmann, Homeopathically, only three died, which is only one to every 74 $\frac{2}{3}$ .

Again, in the Edinburgh Infirmary, out of twenty-one cases of Peritonitis there were six deaths, or about one to every four. Whereas in one hundred and five cases treated by Dr. Fleischmann only five died, or about one to every twenty.

Let us recapitulate :

#### INFLAMMATION OF THE LUNGS.

Treated Allopathically.....	909	Treated Homeopathically....	299
Died.....	212	Died.....	19
About 23 per cent., or nearly 1		About 6 per cent., or nearly one	
in every 4.		in every 16.	

#### PLEURITIS.

Treated Allopathically....	111	Treated Homeopathically....	224
Died.....	14	Died.....	3
About 13 per cent., or 1 in 8.		About 1 per cent., or 1 in 74 $\frac{2}{3}$ .	

#### PERITONITIS.

Treated Allopathically....	21	Treated Homeopathically....	105
Died.....	6	Died.....	5
About 28 per cent. or 1 in 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ .		Little over 5 per cent. or 1 in 21.	

We have selected the most dangerous acute diseases, to show the relative merits of the Homeopathic system of medication by the use of infinitesimal doses, without shedding one drop of blood or using blisters, cupping-glass or cathartics, and the results of the Allopathic system with the use of all these means. You may deny these statements, but they are authenticated facts, and have been presented as such to the world, and remain undisputed by your authors, as far as statistical reports to the contrary are concerned. We have selected them from the fact that we often hear it repeated by Allopathists that our treatment is good for children, but it fails in severe cases of acute diseases in adults. If the power of medicine can tell in any position where the system is wrecked with disease, here is a chance for it to speak in unmistakable language to the patient, either for good or for evil. Here your school treat 1041 and lose by death 232, one in every  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , whereas 628 are treated Homeopathically, with a loss of 27 by death, or one in  $23\frac{1}{4}$ .

But, my dear sir, you will find that in all diseases where life soonest terminates in consequence of their severity, and where your system signally fails, ours triumphs with significant results. As an illustration we refer you to the July number of the *British Journal of Homeopathy*, 1851, where Dr. Martin reports his treatment of Yellow Fever in Rio Janeiro, where 3,256 cases were treated, and out of that number 3,029 were cured, or about 93 per cent., and only 227 died, less than 7 per cent. In New Orleans Drs. Davis and Holcomb show overwhelming evidence in favor of Homeopathy in this most fearful of all diseases. On page 503 of the *North American Journal* 555 cases are reported, of which 522 were cured, or about 94 per cent., and 33 died, less than 6 per cent.

Now look at the reports of Allopathic physicians: Dr.

Jewett, of Philadelphia, reports: Number of Cases, 44. cured, 10; died, 34; about 77 per cent. See *New York Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 12, Page 149.

Again, in the *Medical Circular*, Vol. 2, Page 233, we have the following report from an Allopathist of his treatment of Yellow Fever on board Her Majesty's ship *Dauntless* at Barbadoes: Number of cases, 158; cured, 79; just every other man, or, if you prefer, 50 per cent.

We would be glad to dismiss you without any further goading from the horns growing out of these infinitesimal Homeopathic doses, but we cannot, as we are writing not for your good, but to save the lives of posterity by helping to defend the principles of Homeopathy, and we know of no way better calculated to do this than to set facts before the people.

We therefore invite you, and all others who fear death from Allopathic doses, to carefully study the results of the two systems in treating

### ASIATIC CHOLERA.

The following statistics were gathered partly by Dr. Rath, an Allopathist who was sent by the King of Bavaria to collect authentic information regarding the success of Homeopathic treatment in this terrible scourge:

TREATED HOMEOPATHICALLY.	TREATED ALLOPATHICALLY.
In Bavaria 1,269 cases, with 85 deaths, or $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.	In Bavaria, 12,753 cases, with 6,163 deaths, or $48\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
In Cincinnati, O. 1,116 cases, with 35 deaths, an average of 3 per cent.	In Paris, 6,543 cases, with 3,374 deaths, or $51\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
In Liverpool, 157 cases, with 45 deaths, an average of $24\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.	Dundee Hospital, 157 cases, with 87 deaths, an average of 61 4-5 per cent.
In Edinburgh, 133 cases, with 48 deaths, an average of $27\frac{1}{2}$ .	In Stockholm, 4,143 cases, with 2,477 deaths, an average of $59\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.



## TREATED HOMEOPATHICALLY.

In Lancaster and Glasgow, 76 cases, with 6 deaths, an average of 8 per cent.

In Vienna, 380 cases, with 49 deaths, an average of  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

In Vienna, Moravia, Bohemia and Hungary, 1,093 cases, with 95 deaths, or  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

In Russia, Austria, Berlin, and Paris, 3016 cases, with 264 deaths,  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

The Council General, the Hon. Alexis Eustaphie, collected by order of the government 1,270 cases, with only 108 deaths, or  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

## TREATED ALLOPATHICALLY.

In Christiana, 2,318 cases, with 1,506 deaths, an average of 65 per cent.

In Helsingfors Rus, 3,382 cases, with 1,607 deaths, or  $48\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

In Copenhagen, 7,515 cases, with 4,074 deaths. 55  $\frac{1}{5}$  per cent.

In Paris Hospital, 4,203 cases, with 3,144 deaths.  $74\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

In Sweden, 1,165 cases, with 735 deaths, 63 per cent.

In Banlzic, 900 cases, with 555 deaths.  $61\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

In Berlin, 1,285 cases, with 832 deaths.  $64\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

It would appear that the most incredulous disbeliever in Homeopathy would yield their wilful belief to the facts as quoted above. But we cannot dismiss this part of our letter without referring you to the report of twenty years' practice in Homeopathy by Dr. Fleischmann, which ought to palsy the hand of any man who would presume to administer crude drugs in Allopathic form, or silence the tongues of those who advocate the use of measures so destructive to life, when a better and safer way can be chosen. We quote verbatim from Dr. Hempel's letter to Prof. Palmer, page 27 :

"Fleischmann treated 1053 cases of Pneumonia, cured 1004, 48 died, and 6 cases remained. Percentage of deaths a little over  $4\frac{1}{2}$ . His cases contained a goodly number complicated with typhoid.

"Erysipelas—514 cases treated, 510 cured, 4 died of gangrene.

"Diarrhea, 323 cases treated, 319 cured, 3 died.

"Ophthalmia of different kinds, 130 treated, 129 cured, 1 remaining."

"Inflammation of joints, 888 cases treated, 877 cured, and 7 died of miliaria.

"Angina Faucium—920 cases received, 919 cured; 1 died of gangrene.

"Cordiac Inflammation—57 cases received, 56 cured, 1 died.

"Gastric Fever—1181 cases received, 1173 cured, 7 died.

"Rheumatic Fever—1417 received, 1,416 cured, 1 remained.

"Typhus—3165 cases received, 2779 cured, 368 died, a little more than 1 lost in 9.

"Pleuritis—cases received, 146, cured 142, died 4.

"Rheumatism, Acute and Chronic—759 cases received, 756 cured, 2 died."

"Peritonitis, cases received, 215, cured, 204, died, 11.

"Jaundice, cases received, 87, cured 87.

"Measles, 109 cases admitted, 107 cured, 2 died."

"Dysentery, admitted, 103, cured, 100, died, 3.

"Effusion into the pleura, admitted, 63, cured, 54, died 5.

"Scarlet Fever, 91 cases received, 84 cured, 7 died."

### HOSPITAL STATISTICS.

The following statistics of the St. Louis City Hospital (Allopathic) as embodied in the report presented to the Hon. Board of Health by Dr. Paddock, Resident Physician of the City Hospital, for the half year ending September 30th, 1864, presents in a tabular form the operation of that institution for the period referred to:

ST. LOUIS CITY HOSPITAL, October 1, 1864.

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF HEALTH:—

GENTLEMEN:—In accordance with the requirements of your Honorable body, I herewith respectfully submit for your consideration the following report, being my semi-annual report of the trans-

actions of the Medical Department of the Hospital for the half year ending the 30th September, 1864. The following tables show the whole number of patients treated, their diseases, the number discharged, died, and the number still remaining in the wards.

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
Abscess, . . . . .	6	5	1	
Anasarca, . . . . .	4	1	2	1
Asthma, . . . . .	5	4		1
Ascites, . . . . .	3		1	2
Abortion, . . . . .	1	1		
Ambustio, . . . . .	7	5	1	1
Bronchitis, . . . . .	19	19		
Cancer, . . . . .	7	2	4	1
Contusion, . . . . .	40	31	1	8
Conjunctivitis, . . . . .	2	2		
Concussion of Brain, . . . . .	2		2	
Concussion of Spinal Cord, . . . . .	1		1	
Curvature of Spine, . . . . .	1		1	
Cancerum Oris, . . . . .	1			1
Delirium Tremens, . . . . .	26	22	4	
Debility, . . . . .	81	66	4	11
Dysentery, . . . . .	30	7	21	2
Diarrhea, . . . . .	106	71	23	12
Dementia, . . . . .	1	1		
Dislocation of Hip Joint, . . . . .	1			1
Erysipelas, . . . . .	14	14		
Eczema, . . . . .	1	1		
Frost Bite, . . . . .	2	2		
Fistula in Ano, . . . . .	1	1		
FEVER—Intermittent, . . . . .	53	44		9
Remittent, . . . . .	10	9		1
Puerperal, . . . . .	1		1	
Typhoid, . . . . .	10	2	7	1
Fractures, . . . . .	9	7		2
Furunculus, . . . . .	1	1		

*Hospital Statistics — Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole No. Cases Admitted.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or under Treatment.
Gonorrhea,...	13	12		1
Gleet, ...	1	1		
Hemorrhoids, ....	4	4		
Hemorrhage, Pulmonary,...	1		1	
Hernia, Strangulated,...	2	1		1
Hæmoptysis, ....	1	1		
Hysteria, ....	1	1		
Icterus, ..	4	3		1
Insanity, ....	14	11		3
Inanition, ....	1		1	
Inflammation, ....	2	2		
Leucorrhœa, ....	4	4		
Moribund,....	5		5	
Mania-a-Potu, ....	2	1		
Marasmus, ...	2		2	
Melancholy, ....	1	1		
Menorrhagia, ....	2	1		1
Necrosis, ....	8	6	1	1
Nephritis,....	1	1		
Neuralgia, ....	3	3		
Œdema, ....	1	1		
Opacity of Cornea, ....	1	1		
Ophthalmia,...	32	25		7
Orchitis, ....	3	3		
Pneumonia,...	22	10	12	
Pregnancy and Parturition, ....	74	48		26
Phthisis Pulmonalis, ..	25	8	12	5
Pleurisy, ....	1	4		
Prolapsus Uteri, ....	2	2		
Paralysis, ....	8	5	2	1
Periostitis,...	2	2		
Phlegmon, ....	5	5		

*Hospital Statistics — Continued.*

DISEASES.	Whole Number Cases Received.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Relieved or un- der Treatment.
Premature Labor, .. . . .	1	1		
Paraphlegia,.... . . .	1			1
Rheumatism, .... . . .	47	37		10
Rubeola, .... . . .	5	5		
Syphilis, .. . . .	170	150	1	19
Scabies, .... . . .	5	5		
Sprain, .... . . .	3	3		
Sunstroke, .... . . .	5	1	4	
Scrofula, .. . . .	2	2		
Sore Throat,.... . . .	1	1		
Tumor, .... . . .	2	2		
Toxemia, .... . . .	2	1	1	
Tonsilitis, .. . . .	1	1		
Tetanus, .... . . .	1			1
Ulcer, .... . . .	28	21	1	6
Variola, .... . . .	7	7		
Vulnera, .. . . .	9	7	2	
Varicose Veins, . . . . .	1	1		
Chorea,.... . . .	1		1	
Total,.. . . .	990	731	120	139

On the following page will be found the Report of Sick and Injured treated in Cavalry Bureau Hospital for the Half Year ending August 31st, 1864, by E. C. Franklin, Surgeon in Charge :



*Hospital Statistics — Continued.*

DISEASES.	No. Admitted.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Remaining.	REMARKS.
Arthritis, ....	1	1			{ Died from gangrene of the stump, eight days after the operation.
Abscess,.. ....	8	8			
Amputation,.. ....	1		1		
Bronchitis, ....	31	31			
Catarrh, ....	35	35			
Contusion, ....	98	97		1	{ Complicated with Meningitis, and terminating in typhoid.
Cholera Morbus, ....	4	4			
Diarrhea, ....	95	92		3	
Dysentery,.. ....	32	27		5	
Diphtheritis, ....	3	3			
Erysipelas,.. .	4	4			
Enteralgia, ....	1	1			
Eczema, ....	1	1			
FEVER—Intermittent,	44	44			
Remittent,.. .	98	97	1		
Typhoid,..	38	35	2	1	
Fracture, ....	4	3		1	
Gastritis, ....	11	11			
Gastralgia, ...	1	1			
Gonorrhea, ....	3	3			
Hepatitis, ....	6	6			
Herpes,.. ....	3	3			
Hemorrhoids, .	2	2			
Icterus,.. ....	3	3			
Impetigo, ....	2	2			
Laryngitis, ....	5	5			
Mania-a-Potu, .	2	2			
Nephritis, ....	1	1			
Neuralgia, ...	2	2			
Ophthalmia, ....	18	17		1	
Orchitis, ....	3	6			
Otitis, ...	6	3			

*Hospital Statistics — Continued.*

DISEASES.	No. Admitted.	Cases Cured.	Died.	Remaining.	REMARKS.
Parotitis, ....	4	4			
Pericarditis, ....	2	2			
Periostitis, ...	3	3			
Pneumonia, ....	13	13			
Pleuritis, ....	6	6			
Rubeola, ..	3	3			
Rheumatism,..	19	19			
Syphillis, ....	10	10			
Sycosis, ....	1	1			
Scabies, ..	9	9			
Stomatitis,....	7	7			
Stricture, ..	1	1			
Scorbutus, ...	1	1			
Spinal Meningitis,.	1		1		
Tonsilitus,....	11	11			
Tumor,..	2	2			
Ulcer, ....	17	16		1	
Varicose Ulcer,...	3	3			
Varix, ....	1	1			
Variola, ..	8	8			
Vulnus Inciso, ....	52	51		1	
Sunstroke, ....	1	1			
Tinea Capitis, ....	1	1			
Varioloid, ....	2	2			
All other Diseases,....	89	89			
Total, ....	833	813	5	15	

By reference to the figures, it appears that in the Allopathic Hospital, with all the appliances of comfort, professional skill and attendance the city affords, the number of patients

treated was 990, with a mortality of 120 and 139 remaining in the Hospital. This gives the number of deaths to those admitted in Hospital as over 12 per cent., exclusive of those remaining. The record of the Homeopathic Hospital gives 833 cases admitted, with only FIVE deaths and FIFTEEN remaining in Hospital, making a mortality of six-tenths of one per cent.—a clear gain over its rival institution of eleven and four-tenths per cent. So much for the general results; and to prevent any carping about the matter, let us examine the comparative statistics of the four specific diseases treated in both institutions, and their relative results:

In the Allopathic Hospital there were treated 30 cases of Dysentery, with 21 deaths, making a mortality of 70 per cent. In the Homeopathic Hospital there were treated 32 cases of Dysentery, with no deaths.

Of Typhoid Fever there were 10 cases treated in the Allopathic Hospital, with 7 deaths, making a mortality of 70 per cent.; while in the Homeopathic Hospital there were 39 cases treated, with only two deaths, making a mortality of only 5 and one-tenth per cent.

Of Diarrhea there were treated, in the Allopathic Hospital, 106 cases, with 23 deaths, or a mortality of over 22 per cent.; while in the Homeopathic Hospital there were treated 95 cases of Diarrhea and no deaths.

Of Pneumonia there were treated, in the Allopathic Hospital, 23 cases, with 12 deaths, a mortality of over 52 per cent. In the Homeopathic Hospital there were treated of Pneumonia 63 cases, and no deaths.

Of the four diseases named, the admissions were more than one-sixth of the whole number received into the City Hospital; and as the mortality of these four diseases exceeds that of any other four diseases, and over one-half the whole mor-

tality, it is manifest that the diseases named were the leading and most serious maladies treated in that institution. Taking these four diseases conjointly, it appears, therefore, that 169 cases were admitted into the Allopathic Hospital, of which number 63 died—making a mortality of 37 and two-tenths per cent. ; while the whole number of such diseases admitted into the Homeopathic Hospital were 179 cases, and only 2 deaths, making a mortality of one and one-tenth per cent. Or, to place the results of the treatment side by side, we have :

ALLOPATHIC.				HOMEOPATHIC.			
DISEASES.	No. of Cases.		Percentage.	DISEASES.	No. of Cases.		Percentage.
		Died.				Died.	
Dysentery.....	30	21	70	Dysentery.....	32	0	0
Typhoid.....	10	7	70	Typhoid Fever.....	39	2	5
Diarrhea.....	106	23	22	Diarrhea.....	95	0	0
Pneumonia.....	23	12	52	Pneumonia.....	13	0	0
Average Mortality, 37 2-10 per cent.				Average Mortality, 1 1-10 per cent.			

It is therefore clearly demonstrated that the Homeopathic system of medicine is infinitely superior, as compared with the Allopathic practice in the Hospitals referred to, and that the record of mortality is largely in favor of the Homeopathic system in the general results of Hospital practice, while in the four principal diseases, and those most fatal in their tendencies, the comparison is even more overwhelming in favor of the Homeopathic system of medicine.

Do you think any Allopathist, or any of their institutions under heaven, can obtain such results from your system of

medication? Will you give the credit to small doses or will you say it is all the force of imagination, and Mother Nature? If you can, the Homeopathic profession will be glad to acknowledge your success in pointing them out. But it is all bosh to talk about it, as long as you continue in the use of blisters, bleeding, physicking, scarifying, or puking the poor unfortunate patient to death,—these means, as well as moxas, setons, issues, cauteries, red hot rods of iron, scalding water, whiskey punch, swallow's nests, old hats, hog's lice, pigeon's gizzards, or hog dung, will fail to produce such happy results.

Are we not, therefore, justifiable in the opinion that we have fully established our law of cure? and have we not demonstrated, in an unanswerable manner, the power of infinitesimal doses as therapeutic agents? And we ask you, *don't these minute doses cure?*

It is unnecessary to multiply these statements further. One fact is apparent, that the same happy results are always presented in favor of Homeopathy in those diseases which are the most fatal under Allopathic treatment, such as scarlet fever, diptheria, yellow fever, dysentery, pneumonia, enteritis, peritonitis, etc., as the statistics above will verify, but we chose to present statistics of the most fatal disease that ever scourged the world. Can you, as an Allopathist, with these facts placed in your hands, ever so far depart from the mark of a christian as to again assert that "in severe attacks of acute or contagious diseases Homeopathy proves a failure," when from testimony we show 30 per cent. in favor of Homeopathic practice? If, then, by the use of these infinitesimal particles of medicine, which have become a by-word and derision in the mouths of all Allopathic physicians, we can save from thirty to forty per cent. more of our patients from



the ravages of these dreadful scourges, we think the evidence is conclusive, either that the minute quantities which are exhibited by Homeopaths, *do* cure their patients, or that the massive doses exhibited by Allopathic practitioners kill theirs. You are left to the alternative of choosing between the two, —the curing, or killing power of medicine. We appeal to your better judgment, and to the enlightened reason of every man if we have not clearly demonstrated the curative relation of drugs to disease when given upon the principle of Homeopathy? Let the people hear your answer! PROVE THE STATEMENT FALSE, OR STAND BRANDED WITH DEFEAT!

We dismiss this argument with a few reflections upon the practice of your school in cholera. Shall we call it a system, a theory, a principle, or shall we adopt the language of Dr. Hooker, an Allopathist, and say, "'Tis not one mode, one thing, one system, one combination, one practice. It is wide and diversified, including all principles and theories held and propagated by all regular members of the profession. It contains much that is good, and much that is bad, good Allopathist and bad Allopathist, judicious practitioner and injudicious practitioner." We accept this definition as very good, and approximates nearly to the truth, although a little might be added that would reflect it more clearly, viz: "a regular 'hotch pot' of ideas, theories, and principles derived from empiric practice, having no foundation in truth, and results in multiplying disease and suffering, and ending in early death." Hear him: "It includes all views and theories held by Allopathists of the regular profession," that is, all who hold the docurate of qualification. Yet some of these are good Allopathists, and some are bad. However, if a bad Allopathist introduces a formula, a theory, a principle, it is Allopathy. For Dr. Hooker says it includes everything com-

ing from regular members of the profession—all things, all modes, all systems.

Not so with the Homeopathist. His principles confine him to one law, one rule, one theory, one practice—the law of a dependence existing between disease and remedies, expressed more commonly by the maxim of “Like to cure its like,” and no Homeopathist can possibly be a bad Homeopathist if he administers his remedies upon that law, with its auxiliary principles and theories. And when a Homeopathist prescribes according to any other principle, that moment he loses his right to be called a Homeopathist, and, according to Dr. Hooker’s definition of the old school, he becomes an Allopathist and nothing else.

But let us return, and give a bird’s eye view of the

#### TREATMENT OF CHOLERA,

Instituted by your “regular” gentry. As you cast your eyes around upon the many prescriptions, we ask as a matter of courtesy to the people of Delavan, that you inform them, through their weekly journal, which, among them all, you would consider good Allopathy, and which bad. Which do you consider is the judicious, and which the injudicious prescriptions, and at what stage of the disease shall we assail the dying patient with remedies upon the law of contra irritants—when upon the principles of revulsive and derivative, or when upon the antipathic? Which are the good and which the bad prescriptions, and, finally, are they not all according to the strict tenets of your system, perfectly correct?

It is painful to relate that after all the experience your school has had in this disease, that you still grovel in the dark, or that unaided by the Hahnemann theory you could not point out a single remedy upon which you felt any confidence in the administration. In this disease you are left to

the wild fancy of empiricism in the selection of your remedies. Unaided by any law of dependence existing between the disease on one hand and the therapeutic action of the remedy on the other, you must ever grovel in the dark. Your system is like the great ship in a storm, without rudder or compass, thrown and tossed about at the mercy of the waves, and as it is dashed to pieces amidst the wild howlings of the storm, so perishes your patient amid groanings, wails, and frantic cries for help, but alas, there is no help from Allopathic hands.

Let us see if this is random talk, unadvisedly uttered.

From statements gathered from your works on practice, it appears that all is confusion in the treatment of this disease. One remedy after another is put forward and tried ; one physician extols one thing, and another condemns it as utterly worthless ; one says brandy and opium, or powerful stimulants alone, will save the patient, another says the administration of brandy or alcohol is sure death ; one says astringents, strong and powerful, hermetically seal the bowels and save the patient's life, another says astringents are sure death, the bowels must be regulated as soon as possible by calomel, rhubarb and oil. Now, why do we find such a heterodoxical mess, such confusion of ideas in your practice, when all is perfect order, system, rule and harmony in our views in relation to the manner of treating this disease ? Simply for the reason that everything in our practice is reduced to an unfailing science of therapeutics ; the H<sup>o</sup>meopathist seeks not to prescribe for the name of a disease, but gives his remedies to cover the totality of the symptoms present, and through the different stages he has his specific remedy, justly appropriated to cover the symptoms of the stage for which it is selected. This dependence controls every thought in selecting an ap-

propriate remedy to meet the phenomena of the case.

Can you speak thus authoritatively? Can you turn to your *Materia Medica* and select a single remedy upon any known therapeutic law, that is justly entitled to cure the particular symptoms for which it is prescribed, from any law of dependence known to exist between the disease and remedy?

According to Dr. Hlooker's definition of Allopathy, A can bleed, and treat by a transfusion of blood from a healthy to a dying patient, by which he *hopes* to sustain life; B can administer calomel in large or small doses, he may or may not mix it with opium; or he may give opium; or he may give calomel, opium, tartaric acid, antimony, emetics, cold water and ice, and yet be following the avowed principles of the old school; C may give brandy and water, wet sheet packs and cayenne, cold and hot baths,—burnt brandy, blisters and hot air were strongly recommended by Dr. Conant, a personal friend of ours; D can give rhubarb, astringents and gum-water mixed with calomel; E electricity and salines by mouth and rectum; F may give hot water, opium, quinine and brandy, or injected into the veins; G can administer by inhalation ammonia, camphor, musk, phosphorus, strychnine, essential oils, aromatics; H vegetable astringents, acetate of lead, sulphate of copper, quinine, arsenic, and iron; J may use blisters of cantharides or potato bugs, assisted by hot oil of turpentine over the bowels, foot baths, mustard plasters, cupping-glass, mint juleps, alcoholic stimulants or brandy in large or small doses, opium with camphor. These, and a host of other trash such as the above, is found in the *Medical Times and Gazette*, as quoted from October number, 1853. We make the following quotation from Cockburn: "All the ordinary medical theories and speculations have entirely failed in leading to any beneficial results in the treatment of

this disease. Medicines the most potent and dangerous have been given at a mere venture, and unfortunate cholera patients have been made the subjects of the most undisguised experimentation. One remedy after another has been brought forward and extolled, and each in its turn has been demolished. In the *Medical Circular* a writer strongly urges astringents because they hermetically seal up the bowels, entirely dissipate the poison, and restore the patient to health. Another, doubtless ridiculing the idea of hermetically sealing the bowels to cure cholera, recommends to 'plug up the anus in order to stop the discharges from the bowels, as that must be far more effectual than astringents.' "

Dr. Clutterbuck, in his remarks before the Medical Society of London, November 12, declared that he had no confidence in the employment of active medicines in cholera, as they added to the danger, and that more persons were destroyed by the treatment than were saved, and added that *he very much doubted if any were saved*. He condemned large doses of calomel and opium.

In the same journal, Vol. 5, page 181, we find this language. "The cause of cholera has been the radiant bubble which physiologists, like children, have pursued through all the devious paths of philosophical investigation, found everywhere yet nowhere, and vanishes like a spectre when apparently found in some earthly shape."

Mr. Cox writes thus: "My experience of the malady in question during 1849 was very great, and I enjoyed very extensive opportunities of witnessing the results of various modes of treatment on a large scale." From the very extensive opportunity for observation offered him, he makes the statement that "stimulants of every class and description are in the highest degree pernicious, and that in proportion to



their potency, the most powerful stimulants being the most hurtful and dangerous. Turpentine was given by myself in nine cases, of which seven proved fatal, and I witnessed it administered in twenty more cases, sixteen of which resulted in death. In fact, excepting the saline mode, it is by far the most murderous mode of treatment yet adopted or suggested."

My dear sir, will you mark this expression "*most murderous* mode of treatment," an absolute admission that other modes of treatment adopted by your school were murderous, but this was more murderous than any other, excepting the saline. If under this method seven out of nine, and sixteen out of twenty die, what must have been the results following the use of the saline? We leave it for you to answer. It is an acknowledgement however, that Allopathic practice is *pernicious and murderous*, and that they kill many who might have been spared to bless their families and friends. You say Homeopaths fail in cholera; fail in what? In killing their patients? We cannot speak thus complimentary of Allopathists,—they do kill; God and the people know that to be so, and Allopathists acknowledge the facts by the following statements, summaries from the above quotations:

"Active medicines are dangerous in cholera."

"It destroyed more than were saved."

"I doubt if any were ever saved."

"It has been radiant with bubbles, which the physiologists have followed like children."

"Seven out of nine die;" "Sixteen out of twenty die."

"It is the most murderous treatment, excepting the saline."

"Pernicious and murderous practice."

May I again ask you, which is good Allopathy, and which is bad? which is judicious, and which injudicious practice? or, in other words, which kills and which cures? Each one

is given in accordance with your avowed principles, yet many of the remedies entering into them have therapeutic actions directly at variance with each other. The Allopathists certainly are not ignorant of this fact. How, then, can they expect to derive any permanent good from their prescriptions? As we have in another place shown, a large proportion of the prescriptions in your practice contain remedies which more or less chemically destroy each other, while in others such a chemical change takes place by compounding them that they have an effect entirely different from what was originally intended, or had they been given separately. Therefore the Homeopathist never compounds remedies, or mixes two or three different kinds together in the same glass when administering them to his patient, but acting upon the law of relationship, they become specifics in his hands, obviating the necessity of this jumbled up mess. We recently had the pleasure of examining one of your prescriptions, composed of aconite, verratrum, belladonna and morphine, all in the same glass, at the same time saw administered to the patient a teaspoonful of camphor and assafoetida, and also heard an order for an enemas of half an ounce of the last named remedy. Now, if you know anything about the action of one remedy upon another, you know these ingredients will not harmonize in their action. As Prof. Merrill says, "in half of the prescriptions made by the physicians, their combination is such that one contradicts the therapeutic action of the other, or in other words, one remedy antidotes the other, so that, if either had been correctly chosen, its action becomes lost for favorable results on account of the war of extermination going on in the system between the drugs." Thus you have the happy faculty of mixing all the remedies together which Allopathic experience has taught you cured somebody

else under similar circumstances, and after combining the many in one, pour it down your patient, hoping you may hit the disease, and miss the patient. Unfortunately for both you and the patient, the disease in this case was missed, and the patient, as we believe, was killed. Had you understood the law of dependence between disease and remedies, you could have selected upon this law, a remedy whose specific action would have hit the disease and saved the patient. Here is one of the most significant failures in the principles of Allopathy, and shows how fatal must be a practice which prescribes for a group of symptoms under the name of a disease. In the room of adopting this course, the Homeopathist would prescribe for the totality of the symptoms, regardless of the name of the disease. So perfect is this law, that if symptoms are strongly pronounced, he can prescribe with an abiding confidence in God that the means will be blessed. Therefore it is not Homeopathy, but God revealed through His own divine laws.

Having a feeling of pity for you in the uncomfortable position you are naturally forced as an Allopathist, we will leave you to wallow through the cess-pool, the mire, of the old school teaching, as best you can. In passing through, should you be haunted by the ghosts of innumerable victims who have been sent prematurely to the world of spirits, in consequence of a practice "so diversified in its combination" that it includes "all theories and all principles propagated by all regular members of the profession," or should you hear the groans of thousands of haggard walking skeletons in human form whose constitutions have been destroyed by "injudicious practitioners" who recklessly or empirically prescribed one or more of the four hundred and ten prescriptions found in the formulas recommended by the Royal College of Phy-

sicians, London, or should you meet a few hundred of mercurialized wretches, with rotten teeth, ulcerated throats, carious bones, pestiferous breaths, the legitimate work of some of the "bad practitioners," and should this army revile you or cast denunciations against you, as they go hobbling along, some on one leg, some with canes and crutches, some with cork extremities, club feet, crooked backs, enlarged spleens, rotten livers, gouty, rheumatic, one-eyed, lop-eared, dropsical, or diabetic patients; if the sight of this army, the legitimate fruits of Allopathy, smites your conscience, we advise you to seek safety in the folds of Homeopathy, for the wails of such a motley crowd, such tortured beings, haunt us not, nor do the ghosts of murdered millions disturb our peaceful midnight slumbers.

We have drawn a faint picture of the results of the two systems when practiced side by side. We have given you quotation after quotation from your own approved authors. Are these warning voices only a "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal?" Does not the loss of some twenty patients in a year, with the small practice you have had, speak in tones of thunder, when, by your side, we have done nearly double the amount of business that you have, without the loss of a patient?

We do not say this boastingly. God forbid. For of all men, we feel the most humble, and rely upon the smiles of an approving heaven to bless our labors. It may be that you are right when you say it is all luck and chance with us. If so, we thank heaven for the luck which has come to our patients through the laws of Homeopathy.

How vastly different are the two systems in practice and results. Homeopathy is never considered dangerous; it is pure, cleanly, neat and wholesome; its remedies are neither

sickenings to the stomach, offensive to the taste, or disagreeable in their operations, but on the contrary are always inviting, and satisfactory in their results. The Homeopathist is never accused of killing his patient. Nevertheless, when one dies your fraternity utters the most lamentable groans, and evinces deep pity for the "victimized dupes of Homeopathy," as though such an occurrence was unknown among your practitioners; and every old Mrs. Grundy, Widow Bedott, or Miss Sniffles this side of New Jerusalem, Hepsidam, or the Holy Mountains, who believes in the old system, exclaims, "There! I told you so! that child wanted physic, or some mullen leaves and pennyroyal steeped for tea; then, if it didn't operate, give it an injection of soft soap and molasses." To which Dr. J. B. HEMINWAY, of Delavan, Wisconsin, politely bows, with the assurance, "That's so," considering he has given the Homeopathic system another mighty whack.

We once listened to the defence of Allopathy by a good old lady who went it strong on that platform. It appeared a child had had dropsy on the brain. The mother wanted the Homeopathic practice, but grandmother ordered it otherwise, and called for Dr. Harding. The child died. To exonerate herself, soften the mother's feelings, and justify the worthy functionary, the old lady persisted in saying, "that everything was done that orter be in sich cases. The Doctor stuck hard to the little critter from beginnin' to end, but the poor little cherub was tew sick to live. God wanted it for a little jewel, so He jest tuck it hum. Poor little beauty, it was awful sick. The doctor done his purtiest; he gave it physic every day, several pukes, then he shaved all the hair off its little curly head—oh! it was a proper hansum child, you know!—then he put a blister on its head, one on each arm



and each of its little legs—you know he wanted to draw the water out of the brain, then I kept 'em runnin' for a long time with wilted cabbage leaves and horse radish—you know that's good to make the blisters run. But the child didn't get any better, so he called counsel, and had more doctors,—the child was awful sick, you know. Then they cupped it in three places, but it died, it did!" The doctor was exonerated, Allopathy was justified, and the old lady's conscience was cleared, but the mother believed the doctor killed her babe. How many such accusations are laid at your door, we know not. How many little ones you and Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup have sent to premature graves, eternity alone can reveal. One thing is sure—no Homeopathist was ever accused of killing his patient, but you have these charges laid at your door.

Where we cheer the patient by our presence, you are feared and frowned upon, not from any personal offence or charm in either, but from the dread of your remedies and the appliances used for the recovery of the patients. Your remedies being filthy, impure, sickening to the stomach, are dreaded by the patient, whereas ours are the opposite of this. Homeopathy sheds not one drop of blood, neither does its therapeutic law require it to inflict one single pain. But you inflict pain and suffering, your remedies are offensive to the taste, loathsome, degrading, uncleanly in their operation, disgusting to the sight, poisoning the room with a pestiferous stench, fit only for Allopathic practitioners to breathe, and which can be snuffed with tolerance only by those who prefer a dirty, disgusting practice, to one clean and pure. Homeopathy is never considered dangerous, hazardous, or murderous. Allopathy, on account of her massive doses, is considered dangerous, empirical, hazardous, and is justly accused of killing

its thousands and tens of thousands. Homeopathy leaves no trace of medicinal disease in the wake of her practice. Allopathy leaves its patients lingering under the influence of medicinal poisons, entailing a life of untold misery and suffering, and leaving the system in such a state that the patient must ever be fighting disease and death at arm's length. Homeopathy seeks to enlighten the people and warn them against the dangerous habit of using poisonous drugs; she courts investigation. Allopathy has ever labored to keep the people in ignorance in relation to the science of medicine, and veiled everything in mystery, conveying the idea that the science of medicine should be known only to the favored few, and shuns investigation, to the utter exclusion of our articles in reply to his palpable falsehoods, whereas Homeopathy invites him to reply to any and all the accusations our authors publish against that system which we consider so dangerous to the health and lives of community.

These are not mere vague and empty assertions, but positive lamentable facts, which every member of the profession knows is true. If your theory of practice is right, based on truth and a scientific law of therapeutics, why shun investigation? Why does your school so basely misrepresent us before the people? Why try to crush us by a spirit of persecution? If our principles are not of God, they will come to naught; i. e., if our system is any way deficient in healing the sick, it will come to naught; but if it is more successful than Allopathy, be careful lest peradventure you be found fighting against his laws.

The great fault of the adherents of both schools are, that they rest satisfied if the patient recovers, and attribute the cure to the successful use of the remedies, without seeking the knowledge of what produced the cure. This is all wrong.

The chief consideration should be, how was this cure produced? What remedy did you prescribe? What law did you give that remedy upon? What symptoms do you expect it to cure? Will any other remedy answer in its place, and why not? Was the remedy selected empirically, or was it selected from an unerring law of dependence between disease and remedy? Has the same remedy on a former occasion cured symptoms corresponding to these? If so, was the remedy given because it happened to cure some other patient, or was it given upon fixed laws and principles, known to be true? These, and a thousand other considerations entering into the interest of the public health, should institute the strictest inquiry into the causes of cures, as well as failures, and when this interest is properly awakened, and a spirit of investigation shall take the place of persecution and abuse, then will Homeopathy arise in the glory of its beauty, to crush the wails and groans of countless millions who otherwise must follow in the wake of those that have gone before.

If Allopathists wished their system to be made public, and feared not, why did the translator of the first medical work into the English language suffer such uncalled for persecution? Why was the throne of England petitioned to have the work suppressed? And why was the royal seal placed to the act of the English Parliament prohibiting its sale, and forbidding a prescription being written in the English language? Because they feared to let facts be known just as they existed, and the same dread of investigation is as apparent to-day as in times of yore. It was not policy to let the people know that hen's dung, swallow's nests, maiden's hair, men's blood, wolf guts, boar's teeth, old hat, pigeon's gizzards, hen and hog dung, human excrement, water of men, oxen and cows, bull's tails, man's skull, viper's grease, hog's lice,

sheep ticks and bed bugs were being crammed into their stomachs by your regular gentlemen. Neither is it very agreeable to this class of mathematical gentlemen to have others teach that the use of blisters, cupping glasses, setons, hot tar, scalding water, splitting tongues, mercurial salivation, whiskey punch, puking and physicking, or hermetically sealing the anus, is the correct way to cure a sick and dying patient. It is a very unpleasant feeling to be thus publicly held up between heaven and earth, to be pitied by angels, scorned by men and punished by God, for the blighting diseases and withering influence upon the system of man following your practice, the marring of the intellect, and thousands of your acknowledged slain.

Truly, you have some reason for prejudice against the Homeopathist, when he strips the covering from your system, and exposes its skeleton hand. But where do we go for our proof? Not among the Homeopathists, but to your own libraries—works written by those included in the first class on page 11; in the public streets, among the walking skeletons—dupes and victims of Allopathy; to the bed-side of your patients; to the books of the sexton; and to the tombs of the cemetery. In all of these places we gather our testimony, and nowhere else. In all our quotations showing the evils which attend and follow in the footsteps of the regular practice, the “diversified combination” of “good and bad Allopathists,” not one have we taken from our authors which we designed should stamp you with crime for upholding a system which ultimates in such loss of life, but all have come from your own authors. Whatever part of this letter may have shown a want of that candor or consistency which should always characterize the dignity of the profession, has been given for a like consideration, our principle effort being to establish two

points: first, the true principles of Homeopathy, and second, to condemn your practice by your own authors. You must abide their testimony. By their works you stand convicted of upholding and practicing a system that "has done more harm to the world than war, pestilence and famine combined;" and further, "that the world would be better off if there was not a physician, a drug store or a man midwife in the world;" and still further, "that the system of medicine as now practiced, *cannot be made any worse, it must mend or end.*"

In view of the testimony we have produced against your system, the contradictory views, each of which are heralded as facts, the acknowledgment that Allopathy embraces everything good and bad, we should suppose that you would hardly dare call Homeopaths quacks, knaves, or fools. Suppose we should retort upon you in the same way, would the people consider we had presented any arguments against your system? Of course not. It would only be an acknowledgment that we were driven to the last extremity to protect our craft. The lowest denizen of the Five Points in New York city can call us hard names, and spread as many false statements as he pleases about you and me. But are these things arguments? Do they destroy or in any way detract from the intrinsic worth and merit of either the Allopathic or Homeopathic system? No indeed! But the reader may say we have uttered hard things against your system. On the tenth page of this letter we remarked that we should say many things against Allopathy that were hard and seemingly untrue; and we now, as we did then, invite you to point out anything in relation to the teachings and practice of the two systems, that is not fairly represented. You have labored to expose us to the ridicule of the world by misrepresenting our principles in re-



lation to the size of the dose, and telling the people just what Homeopathy is not. Represent our system as it is and we are content. On the other hand, we have shown from your own authors what Allopathy was, and what it is, and what it must be to continue to exist. We have only used the Allopathic lever and the Homeopathic fulcrum, and day by day this fulcrum is being placed nearer the tottering pyramid of Old Physic; day by day we feel this resistance less to be overcome, and soon it must tumble into the "last ditch."

We can assure you that a rapid change is taking place in the minds of the people in favor of the curative principle instead of the killing power of medicine. You mistake the signs of the times if you think the people can be chained longer to a system that does not claim to be one mode, one thing, one theory. This "very diversified combination, which includes much that is good and much that is bad," are shackles which can no longer be forced upon the people.

In your next excommunication against the Homeopathist please inform the people which one of all the views entertained by your regular gentry as quoted on page 66 from Allopathic authors to cure consumption, is good Allopathy and which is bad; or turn to page 62 and select from the different theories those which are judicious and those which are injudicious modes of treatment; or turn to the quotations we have made in relation to Allopathic treatment for cholera, and then submit to your supporters which they would prefer of this "very diversified combination, this "rational and consistent theory," including the "animalist," the "vitalist," the "solidist," the "chemist," the "Brunomians," the "Cullenites," or the "expectorants." Which treatment among the following do you concede lengthens the lives of your patients and which adds most to their future misery: Blood-let-

ting, purgatives, vomiting, sweating, stimulating, blistering, cupping-glasses, canterizing, salivating, hot tar, scalding water, mercurial salivation, or slitting of tongues? Or if you have a very sick patient, would you make an Allopathic stew of all these in your "hotch-pot of wild and vague therapeutic ideas," adding a swallow's nest, a few hen's gizzards, some earth-worms and hog's lice, with a few other of those delicate morsels, call counsel, and recommend the poor fellow to take them all. These doubtless were the views entertained by Dr. Hooker when he considered everything Allopathy coming from the regular profession, be it ever so diversified in its combination.

#### NAMING THE CHILD.

We happened to be present at a counsel of these regular gentlemen which forcibly illustrated the merits of this theory which is "not one mode, one practice, one thing." There was no mistaking the symptoms manifested, and to us there was but little difficulty in selecting the appropriate remedies Homeopathically to cover the totality of the symptoms. But as Allopathy prescribes for the name of the disease, or a multitude of symptoms under one general name, the dispute ran high as to what name best covered the symptoms. Until that point was finally settled no prescription could be made. This is called diagnosing the disease, i. e., to classify the symptoms so as to give them a certain name before prescribing. As Dr A. was the attending physician, we will introduce his testimony in relation to the condition of the patient. When first consulted, he said, "I found the pulse hard, quick and wirey, brown coating on the tongue, bowels had been irregular for some time, nausea at the stomach, pain of a sharp lancinating nature in the side, stomach, bowels, along the sternum, and under the shoulder blade; she had a feeling of

soreness in the liver. The feelings were all preceded for some time by lassitude. This led me to suspect acute inflammation of the liver. The pains were so severe that I instituted copious bleeding, mercurial cathartics and opiates. On the second day I repeated the bleeding. On the fourth day, finding so little improvement, I used the cupping-glass, and, as I then supposed, with favorable results. On the sixth day she began to sink very rapidly, and this morning you find her, gentlemen, as she is."

Dr. B—"Was there any difficulty in breathing?"

"Yes; considerable."

"Did you examine the lungs in reference to pleuritis friction, and if so, what was the sound you derived on auscultation and percussion?"

"I considered the case so clearly defined that I had no hesitation in pronouncing the disease acute hepatitis."

"Was there a cough at first, as now?"

"Yes, considerable."

"Were there sharp lancinating pains in the side on breathing?"

"Yes; very severe indeed."

"Well, Dr. A, I am surprised at your judgment in diagnosing this case. You have neglected a part of your duty as a physician. It is evident you have a case of pleuritis. The other difficulties in the bowels are due in all probability to the catamenia, which I learn should have made their appearance at the time of her first sickness. What is your opinion?"—addressing Dr. C.

Dr. C—"I consider you both mistaken, gentlemen. I have heard your opinion with considerable interest. It is a fair case of inflammation of the right lung. Doubtless the pleura is more or less involved. The cough present, and the

character of the sputa, the flush on the cheeks, leaves but little doubt in my mind in relation to the case. She required in addition to the blood-letting and blisters, tartar-emetic, mercury and opium. That is my opinion."

Dr. D—"It is certainly strange that there should be any difference in opinion about this case. You are wild in your diagnoses, gentlemen, wild. I shall presume to call it a fair case of neuralgia of the liver and stomach. The other accompanying symptoms are only sympathetic. I earnestly recommend narcotics, and a continuation of external irritants."

Dr. E—"Really, gentlemen, I can hardly refrain from calling you all drunk or fools. I see no difficulty in diagnosing this case. The lady was taken sick at the time the menses should have made its appearance. I am therefore inclined to the opinion that it is an aggravated case of Dysmenorrhea, accompanied by a cold which has left the lungs somewhat irritated with the cough. The symptoms in the side and stomach, as well as the difficult breathing, are only sympathetic. Narcotics should be liberally used."

Dr. F—"Well, gentlemen, you may all be right, or you may all be wrong, but I am inclined to think none of you have guessed it yet. Doubtless Dr. A was correct in locating the difficulty in the liver. The case is too clear to admit of a doubt. He mistook the name. It is doubtless a stone in the gall bladder, accompanied by bilious fever. He should have given a heavy dose of podophyllum, sweet oil, and in twenty-four hours afterwards a violent emetic. This would have forced the stone into the stomach."

Thus the debate waxed warm, each one sustaining his view by book theory and parallel cases. One *guesses*, another *presumes*, another is *inclined to the opinion*, another *thinks*, and

so on *ad libitum*. Now why all this confusion about naming the disease? The child is born, i. e., the symptoms were present, and plainly indicated, and those symptoms were but the expression of the disease, made manifest through this suffering. This is what the patient wanted removed. Now why wrangle and jangle about the name of the disease? For no other reason than the want of a correct therapeutic law, to enable them to select a remedy whose pathogenetic relation is plainly indicated by the expression between symptoms present in the disease and the remedy for its cure. Not so with Homeopaths; they never prescribe for a group of symptoms as a whole under a given name. No jangling over a name ever disturbs their minds before an appropriate remedy can be selected, but each individual phenomenon manifested through symptoms demands his prompt and special attention, and is taken into consideration when he is making up his mind what remedy or remedies cover the totality of the symptoms present.

The Allopathist examines his patient for the purpose of giving a definite and fixed name to a class of symptoms collectively, and when a disease is named, proceeds according to a routine of experimental knowledge, derived from all sorts of sources, to prescribe for his patient. The Homeopathist is opposed to treating disease specifically from its name, but carefully examines his patient in order to find out every symptom, even the most minute, and as he proceeds in this investigation, every symptom delineated calls for a certain remedy. Gathering them as a whole he selects the appropriate remedies with positive assurances of success, whereas, with the Allopathist the name of the disease alone guides him in the selection of the remedy. We appeal to the intelligence of every reader if such a course is consistent? Can you with any in-



telligence designate the remedy to be given, when the name of a disease alone guides you in selecting the medicine? For this reason if you have a patient with constipation you recommend cathartics. If the patient asks what kind, you readily respond, "Oh, almost anything that operates as a cathartic." Here the name alone guides you in the selection of the remedy.

We have on a former occasion remarked that Allopathlists gained their knowledge by experimenting with the sick and dying, as well as upon cats, sheep, dogs and rabbits. For your benefit we make a few quotations from Cockburn, page 18: "The French Academy of Medicine, have given a report of their experience in the treatment of typhoid fever. The medical attendants, consisting of Andral, Louis, Bouilland, and others, physicked one hundred patients without the slightest regard to symptoms, age, sex, or stage of disease. They bled another hundred on the same plan, and with another hundred did nothing. Now," continues the writer, "what could be learned from such indiscriminate wholesale work as this? It is perfectly absurd. No one of any judgment could place any dependence at all on the result of experiments like these."

We quote again: "The illustrious Zimmerman relates the experience of a physician of his own acquaintance, who used to arrange all his patients, between fifty and sixty in number, every morning into four divisions. To the first he prescribed bleeding; to the second, a purgative; to the third, a glyster and to the fourth division a change of air." This is Allopathic experience, upon which you predicate your practice. How far did Sir John Forbes come from the truth when he said: "It would be as well or far better with the patient in the actual condition of the art of medicine, as more generally practiced, if all remedies, at least all active remedies, especial-

ly drugs, were abandoned." Now doctor, we advise you to spend less time in seeking a name for the child, *disease*, and more in the study of our *Materia Medica* and *Symptomacodix*. Names are useful enough so long as you do not let that guide you in the selection of an appropriate remedy, and as an act of mercy we ask, after you have found an appropriate name for the child, *don't spank it too hard*.

You say Homeopathy is opposed to scientific medication and rejects the experience of accumulated ages. If the quotations we have made all through this letter is Allopathic science we shall plead guilty to the charge. But we are not opposed to the "experience of accumulated ages," but profit by its errors. We are, however, opposed to this reckless waste of life by experimenting with remedies upon a law destitute of worth and merit, and as such, Homeopathy will never yield its claims upon humanity until the last weapon of death is laid aside and the last life is lost by the cruelties inflicted at Allopathic hands. This is what Homeopaths are opposing, and thank God we are succeeding. The people are not ignorant of these things. They realize the enormity of your crimes. They dread the Allopathic nostrums. And for this reason your school have resorted to two things: First, stealing Homeopathic remedies and giving them on the sly, and at the same time laboring to crush her practitioners, and the second is your happy resort to

#### PALLIATIVES,

such as blood letting, opiates, etc., by which you cover up the real symptoms of the case, while the disease is still at work, a slow, but sure consuming fire, or until an opiate disease has usurped unlimited control over the organism, or until the patient's life passes away amidst dreams, phantoms and hallucinations, derived from your narcotics (opiates). No part

of your system is better calculated to mislead the patient or the public than this. Neither can any more deceptive means be devised to establish a miserable practitioner, a novice in medicine, a pseudo-Allopathist, than this. The physician knowing its palliative power, prescribes it generally in about one-third of his cases. This leads the patient to believe he is better, and to imagine the doctor understands his case, and has performed almost a miracle, or effected some noted cure, whereas, the reverse of this is true. The primary action of the opium or morphine has only produced a temporary benefit, which subsides as soon as the remedy has spent its force, and then a return of the old complaint makes its appearance with a renewal of the old symptoms, but in a major part of the cases in an aggravated form. This goes on from time to time; at every return of the disease a renewal of the opiates, until the disease becomes worse and worse, more complicated in its nature, more difficult to diagnose, and until his constitution is wrecked, his mind impaired, and his usefulness as an individual is lost to family, friends and community. All the while these opiates are being used he vainly imagines himself better, until some new and more dangerous malady becomes developed which suddenly destroys the patient's life. Then like a drinking hen with eyes cast heavenward, you say "O, mysterious dispensation of Divine Providence! 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord.'" Opium, you should have said. A writer before us, in speaking upon this subject, says: "This system of palliatives, of which at least three-fourths of the prevailing practice consists, fosters and harmonizes with the prevailing evils of the day. Present gratification is wanted, temporary indulgence, regardless of consequences. Give us our stimulants, give us our purgatives, our tonics, our alteratives, our

sleeping draughts, our soothing drops, our stomach bitters, our anti-spasmodics, our carminatives. Against one and all of this fraternity we protest. They are the enemies of health, the generators of disease, and a prolific source of death!" The same author adds: "The resources of the old school, though nominally very extensive, are practically exceedingly limited. Take away their three great sheet-anchors—bleeding, purgatives, and the giving of opium—and what have they left? What could they do? Without these their occupation's gone. All the other paraphernalia is merely trumpery appendages to these great idols. In fact, one would be safe in saying that there is not a case of any serious disease in any part of the world under Allopathic treatment in which at least one if not all of these destructive agents have not been employed. In a very important sense these agents constitute Allopathy; were they relinquished, the system is done to all intents and purposes." This author, having once been an Allopathist, knew whereof he wrote. (Cockburn, on page 20.)

If the Allopathist was ignorant of these things, there might be some apology for the use of these agents. But the fact is, he knows the ultimate results likely to follow when he has once reduced his patient to the necessity of their use. The same may be said of cathartics. The patient once beginning their use, has placed himself upon a horse he will have to ride for life, unless common sense through the light of Homeopathy shall teach him of their evil. It really is sad, lamentably so, to see a physician prescribe cathartics until he has made a permanent complicated medicinal disease, and then prescribe purgatives to physic it off, yet this is no uncommon occurrence. We repeat what you dare not deny, that vast thousands are laboring under drug diseases, result-

ing from the long continued use of remedies under Allopathic treatment. A certain king, knowing the evils following the use of cathartics, caused to be inscribed over the doors of the cathedrals this significant motto: "I was well, thought to be better, took physic and died!" It has passed into a proverbial saying that the more medicine you take the worse you are off, and Dr. Waterhouse, Allopathist, says that "in one year's good ride a physician can open streams sufficient to keep his pond full during life, for the effects of medicinal disease following their use. After a run of sickness he will ever place the patient a constant contributor to the dollars in his pocket." Such persons are never in a sound state of health. *Palliation!* *PALLIATION!* Temporary relief with one remedy after another, and by degrees the patient grows gradually worse until the constitution is permanently destroyed, or the system so susceptible to the influence of other diseases that some dangerous malady seizes upon the more vital organs, and generally terminates fatally.

Is it possible for patients ever to recover from disease under palliatives? Is it not placing the patient on the shortest road to death, by prescribing one palliative to cure the disease symptoms produced by another? Is it possible to cure the sufferings of any person until the causes producing those sufferings are clearly, definitely, and pathologically understood? And is it possible to understand the pathological condition of any disease when a hundred and one different remedies, each of which acts separately, differently and specifically on the organism, have been used? Can you select a remedy capable of destroying the baneful effects of symptoms produced by twenty different poisons combined? We leave these questions for Dr. J. B. HEMINWAY, of Delavan, Wisconsin, to answer. Probably you will find it more difficult to solve them



than to call us a quack. Dr. Lay says "more diseases are manufactured by palliative drugs and medicines than by nature." Dr. Wheeler says: "I have but little difficulty in overcoming natural disease; but when it is complicated with a host of medicinal diseases from the use of palliatives, of which I am in profound ignorance, I have but little hope of doing any good, but fear evil results." Dr. Thomas says: "Knowing my patient has been tinkered at by a score of professional and non-professional quacks, as well as exhausted the drug store of the hundred and one different palliative patent medicines, I abandon all hope of doing him any good by remedies, for he is already literally a drug shop." The learned gentleman, however, prescribes in such cases bread pills, a thorough whiskey punch and alcohol sweat. In the language of another let me say, "Go thou and do likewise."

Who, we ask, is there that is so blind to facts as not to see that the use of medicines on Allopathic principles frustrates nature in the natural workings of the system? Go with me through this community, through the nation, and in every family where you find pill boxes, tonic bitters, patent medicines, and a host of empty vials which once held Allopathic medicine, we will show you a weakly, unhealthy set of beings, always hard-up, battling with the world for a scanty support, and places where Allopathic doctors are no strangers. On the other hand go into those families where physic, patent medicine and Allopathic drugs are feared on account of their poisonous effects on the system, and we will show you a hearty, prosperous, and well to do family. Find us a dyspeptic patient that has never taken Allopathic medicine! Find for me a constipated patient that let's medicine alone, if you can! These would be curiosities for which Barnum

would pay a round sum. On the other hand we can find them by the thousand, made so by your Allopathic system. Even those remedies which are considered so very harmless carry the seeds of death in their wake. On this point we quote from another Allopathic author: "Magnesia, which is called the most innocent medicine, may be the source of the utmost harm, and has been productive of fatal consequences. Masses unchanged have been found after death closely collected together, or patches of the powder adhering with the utmost pertinacity to the intestines. Some very curious instances of this kind are upon record; and some of these cases have been from the apparently suspicious circumstances made subjects of investigation, for death has been attributed to arsenic when *post-mortem* examinations have shown that magnesia taken medically, not arsenic taken as a poison, was the destroying power." Doctor, when you have made free use of this very harmless remedy, did you think that you were liable to produce death by its use? Do Homeopathic prescriptions ever produce such fearful results?

For a further illustration of the use of palliatives, consult Cockburn and Hillyard. We quote again. A report of the Medical Society of London for October 13, 1849, contains the following important remarks, bearing upon this point: Dr. Crisp said: "But as regards the action of calchicum, I think the profession has yet this lesson to learn as to the ultimate effects of particular medicines on the duration of life, and I make this observation now in consequence of a remark made by Dr. Stoke in Dublin that he had never heard of a person who had taken much calchicum living to a great age." Dr. Thomas also said, "I cannot help referring to the observation of Dr. Crisp as to the great importance of considering the ultimate effects of medicines." And yet this medicine

is prescribed empirically by physicians all over the country. The wine of calchicum is prepared, according to the United States Dispensary, by "taking of calchicum root well bruised a pound, wine of sherry two pints. Macerate for fourteen days, with occasional agitation, then express strongly and filter through paper. The dose varies from ten miniums to a fluid drachm, to be taken three or four times a day." Dr. Wood, in a recent publication on neuralgia, thus expresses himself on this very subject: "Some of the most melancholy cases of tic-doloureux which I have ever witnessed have been where opium has been given to mitigate the pain. Time after time has the dose been increased, until to the original morbid state inducing the neuralgia has been superadded the marasmus of slow opium poisoning." Good heavens, what an admission! "*The marasmus of slow opium poisoning!*" Doctor, reflect upon this when you next prescribe opiates as a palliation. Dr. Wood was an open enemy to Homeopathy, and would say as little against his own system as he could and maintain the position he has so meritoriously won as an author.

• Doubtless it is owing to the palliative influence of the lancet that it has become the constant companion of physicians for hundreds of years. That

#### BLEEDING

Is a palliative none will deny, but that it is a curative agent Homeopaths do, and have a right to question, not only from personal observation and pathological facts, but from practice.

As space will not allow us to produce pathological proofs of the ulterior effect following the use of the lancet, we must be content for the present with introducing your own authors to condemn this system which forty years ago was the great sheet-anchor relied upon in Allopathic practice, for as we re-

marked in the beginning of our letter, we shall gather our proofs against Allopathy from his own authors. By that testimony we have condemned your practice, and by that evidence we shall condemn the practice of bleeding. We had supposed that the lancet was put to rest. But from its palliative power country quacks and pseudo-Allopathists are trying to revive its use, and from this consideration its introduction would find but feeble resistance in the minds of those not educated to its injurious effects.

We have frequently asked the advocates to tell us how it became introduced into use. But to this they must plead ignorance. One author supposed it originated from the Hippopotamus, who is reported at a certain season of the year to come up out of the water and strike his leg against some pointed stick or sharp stone, taking care that it should pierce a certain vein. If it had its origin among brutes, let it end where it began. Its introduction was probably owing to some supposed benefit derived from its palliative effects from some accidental bleeding. Others suppose it to have originated from theoretical reasoning, and some think it the adventurous stroke of daring empiricism. Be that as it may, it is in use, has held the people under its power, and has doubtless slain its millions. But, like all other enemies of man in Allopathic practice, it dies a hard death. We had no design of referring to it when we began this letter, but your recent criticism on the death of Mrs. T——, for the want of “copious bleeding,” in a case of typhoid 'pneumonia under the treatment of an imported Allopathist, and its use in one or two other cases not necessary to mention, induces us to set the subject in its proper light before the people.

Could your school revive this system what would be the results? The same that existed in days of yore; i. e., as it

requires no skill in its performance, every blacksmith, horse-doctor, cooper and cobbler would become Allopathic practitioners, and without reflection plunge the lancet into the arm on every trifling occasion. Well do we remember when the old functionaries with saddle-bags on their arms, would come in and without thought or reflection order the bandage and bowl. Bleeding was orthodoxy; right or wrong, it was to be practiced; and generally if the patient was very sick the doctor would impress it deeply in the minds of those present that "the patient would not have lived an hour!" and we have known them to get down to five minutes, yes—"dead in five minutes had I not got here, and bled him." But these short holds on life are not quite as common nowadays, since the lancet has been nearly forced from practice by the power of Homeopathy and reflecting Allopathists.

But to return to the case referred to above. You say "the doctor did not understand her disease, you seldom bleed, but here the lancet should have been used." You cannot form a lower estimate of his professional worth, or politeness as a gentleman than ourself, and we have no reason to dispute you when you say he did not understand her case, and we will go further and say we believe under your treatment she would have recovered, for you have learned by observation too well the power of Homeopathic remedies in inflammation to have had recourse to any other agent. Therefore we repeat, we do not think she would have died under your treatment, neither do we believe you would have bled the patient. That however, being the position you have assumed, we will refer you to the following quotations upon the use of the lancet in inflammatory diseases, taken from the *Foreign Medical Review*. The writer says: "Relying upon the testimony of an incomplete fact, the moment the practitioner ascertains the



existence of inflammation he pulls out his lancet and bleeds his patient copiously. The oppressed vessels being then partly emptied, much relief is experienced and both patient and physician are placed in high hopes that the disease will be cut short. In a few hours, however, the vessels are contracted. They and the heart have adapted themselves to their diminished contents, and nature thereupon resumes the attempt to carry the disease through its proper stages. The pain returns, the pulse rises and the oppression augments." Here palliation did its perfect work at first, but mark you, as soon as the vessels contracted the symptoms were all present. "Again the lancet is used with immediate relief, but the same phenomena recurs," and this alternate bleeding and a return of the symptoms usually follows in all cases where the lancet is used. The author goes on to add, "that with a good constitution and good management, the person may survive. If the constitution is not robust he falls into chronic disease, with an impaired constitution, his strength permanently shaken, and ultimately dies." Such is Dr. Combe's opinion of bleeding in inflammatory diseases.

In speaking upon the death of Lord Byron, Dr. M. Milligan says "he protested against the use of the lancet, but being over persuaded he consented. We seized the favorable moment and drew about twenty ounces. On coagulation the blood presented a strong buffy coat, yet the relief obtained did not correspond to the hopes we had formed; and during the night the fever became stronger than it had been hitherto. The restlessness and agitation increased and the patient spoke several times in an incoherent manner. On the following morning, April 17, the bleeding was repeated twice, and it was thought right to apply blisters to the soles of his feet." The rest of the tragedy is soon told, he died the next day.

Now the question comes, what led to the repetition of the bleeding? Simply the appearance of the buffy coat in the blood. Whereas the truth is the buffy coat is now universally admitted not to be an infallible sign of inflammation, for Drs. Hooper, Marsden, and others have proved that a well marked buffy coat, with retracted and puckered edges may be found in the blood although there be no inflammatory disease present. The mere presence, therefore, of the buffy coat is by no means an indication of the existence of inflammatory action.

Doubtless it is owing to this false opinion that the use of the lancet has been relied upon by your school as the sheet anchor in the treatment of inflammation of the lungs. The disease being of common occurrence, and its palliative influence being always so soon and perceptibly marked, in the more mild cases, led to its general adoption although the sequel being death, yet this effect was overlooked, and the lancet still used, until Hahnemann revealed the better way. On this point let us introduce the testimony of Dr. Todd, Professor of Medicine in King's College: "The plan of treatment which has been recommended by some of our highest authorities, I need not tell you is that of bleeding and tartar emetics. You bleed early from the arm, and if necessary you bleed a second and third time, and if under this treatment resolution (cure) does not rapidly take place, you bleed locally, by leeches and by cupping, and likewise give tartar emetics more or less freely; to all of which counter-irritants by blisters may be superadded in the more advanced stages. I have had ample experience of this treatment, and I must confess that experience has so little satisfied me with it that I have for some years ceased to adopt it, for under the treatment I have seen too many die, and where recovery has taken place, in too many instances has it been with a tedious lengthened convalescence."

We remarked in the fore part of this letter that in proportion to the position a man stood in as a gentleman and a scholar of real worth and merit, would be the weight of his testimony for or against the case in which it is used. Dr. Todd is too well known in the profession not to be heeded. The testimony is directly against the use of the lancet. And he declares so fatal had been its effect that he had long ceased its use. But you say in the case of Mrs. T—— it should have been introduced. Copious bleeding would have saved her life. This talk is consistent with Allopathic practice, viz., the sicker the patient, the nearer death's door by the disease, the more prompt, decided and active the treatment to be adopted.

But let us see how these views harmonize with statistics gathered from practice. We think the public will say, they coincide well, i. e., the appliances are deadly, and the result is death. To establish this point we must quote again from Dr. Speranza. In his *Annals of Medicine* he has published some remarkable observations, which show that the number of deaths in cases of inflammation of the lungs is in direct proportion to the number of bleedings. In one hundred cases in which bleeding was had recourse to from three to nine times twenty-two died; and in one hundred cases in which only three bleedings were resorted to nineteen died; and in one hundred cases where there was no bleeding only fourteen died.

#### TABULAR VIEW.

100 cases, above 9 bleedings.....	68 deaths.
100 “ from 3 to 9 bleedings.....	22 “
100 “ only 3 bleedings.....	19 “
100 “ treated without bleeding.....	14 “
<hr/>	
400 “ Allopathically treated.....	123 “

Compare this fearful mortality under Allopathic treatment by the side of Dr. Fleischmann, a Homeopathist, and the two will stand as follows :

ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT.	HOMEOPATHIC TREATMENT.
400 cases. 123 deaths, or 1 to every $3\frac{1}{3}$ .	1058 cases. 48 deaths. 1 in 22.

For the sake of accommodating you, we admit the Homeopathic system to be the "*do nothing method of treating disease*," but with this do nothing system we have an average of only  $4\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. of deaths placed to her credit, while that of the "*Do Something School*" of which you are so boastful, treats THREE HUNDRED CASES and takes his own report of a loss in these three hundred of 109, by "copious bleeding." Just  $36\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. ; making a total loss by the use of the lancet of  $22\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. ; or 67 out of the three hundred were wilfully, wantonly, and cruelly sacrificed upon this Allopathic altar of human slaughter. Well might the learned Sir Charles declare towards the end of his career that the lancet was the death of thousands. What do you think, in view of these facts, about the propriety of using the lancet in case of inflammation of the lungs? Would you like to have the blood of a venesected patient on your garments? These may be pleasant reflections to an Allopathist, but they would not be to a Homeopathist, and knowing its evil influence on the health, life, and constitution of our patients we let our lancet rest.

Dr. Dietl, of Vienna, gives us the benefit of a little Allopathic experience from his own practice which we submit to your *prayerful contemplation*. Such results from the use of the lancet and large doses of tartar-emetic in inflammation of the lungs should awaken an interest in the feelings of the public against this *palliative* principle of dealing with life. "In 85 cases that were bled seventeen died. One hundred and

six were treated with tartar-emetic and 22 died. One hundred and eighty-nine cases were left to *unaided nature* and of these only 14 died.

### TABULAR VIEW.

85 cases bled ; 17 die. 20 per cent.

106 “ treated by tartar-emetic ; 22 die. 20 7-10 per cent.

189 “ left to nature ; 11 die.  $7\frac{1}{3}$  per cent.

Compare this statement with the cases collected from seven European Homeopathic hospitals as published in the *North American Journal of Homeopathy* and we have the following result :

ALLOPATHIC TREATMENT.	HOMEOPATHIC TREATMENT.
185 cases ; 39 deaths, or about 20 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.	In the 7 hospitals, 710 cases ; 45 deaths. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

You cannot fail to notice what a large per cent. of mortality there is against your system in this disease, owing wholly to this agent so ruthlessly and empirically employed. Please also bear in mind that those 710 patients were spared the sufferings consequent upon the use of cathartics, emetics, blisters, cupping glass, leeches or lancet.

You will also allow us to advise you in future to recommend mother Nature in the room of Allopathic practice to your patients, for according to Dr. Dietl's admission, out of 191 patients treated Allopathically 39 died, but in 189 left to nature only 14 died, showing that 25 were killed outright by this palliative treatment which you recently recommended in the case referred to above. Doubtless if that lady had died under our treatment you and the whole fraternity would have raised the most lamentable whine possible for men to utter, as if such an occurrence never took place under your treatment ; but as it was an Allopathist's patient you can only



say she was lost for want of bleeding. We think she was lost for want of good Homeopathic treatment. Be that as it may, she has gone to rest in the cemetery at Prairie du Chien under circumstances which must stamp her physician with a want of professional decorum to members of his own school in this place and appreciative confidence towards the family to which she was doubtless a loving mother. The glory and honor he won as an Allopathist in this place would have banished a Homeopathist from the community. Let his laurels rest with him.

But to return to our quotation. After giving the results of this practice of bleeding, the same gentleman adds: "We cannot forbear the expression of our belief that venesection favors the spread of hepatization, and favors it all the surer the oftener it is repeated and the poorer the patient is in blood, so that many cases of inflammation, both intense and extensive, are pushed to their height by venesection, and progress and thrive, so to speak, under the lancet." Still further on he adds: "We have not unfrequently remarked that a single venesection, apparently well intended, had as a consequence caused rapid sinking of strength, profuse sweat, millari, vibrating pulse and a rapid fatal termination, and that venesection has its certain and not unimportant share of the great mortality in pneumonia." Comment is unnecessary, but as an illustration of this evil we will close with a quotation from Dr. Reid on this subject, viz: "That less slaughter is effected by the lance than by the lancet, the former being the weapon of death used by the French army in warfare, the latter the Allopathic instrument of human sacrifice."

We can also produce an overwhelming amount of testimony from Allopathic authors against the prevailing practice of bleeding in cases of

## APOPLEXY.

But the limited space we are compelled to occupy will only admit of a few brief quotations. The first we give from Sir George LaFevre, who after a long and elaborate review upon the treatment of apoplexy, and the increasing prevalence of paralysis, says: "It is not improbable that the universal system of blood-letting upon all such attacks, and even threatnings of them, has converted remediable into incurable diseases. Paralysis has sometimes immediately followed the depletion intended to prevent apoplexy."

Who recently bled Mr. Church for paralysis? Did he live long after the "copious bleeding?"

Dr. Clutterbuck says: "As a mere matter of experience there is good reason to believe that blood-letting does much less good, and its omission much less injury than is generally supposed." Dr. Todd thus expresses himself in the *Medical Circular* for April 12th, 1854: "All cases of apoplexy are made worse by bleeding. We lessen the power of the system so to speak to throw off the disease." Dr. Copeman gives the following results of 155 cases gathered from personal experience and observation:

Number of patients bled, 129; cured, 51; died, 78.

Number of patients not bled, 26; cured, 18, died, 8.

Here we notice that nearly two-thirds of those persons bled died, while somewhat less than one-third of those not bled died, making a difference in favor of the non-bleeding treatment of over 50 per cent. The Doctor then goes into a specific statement of the cases, from which we take the following: "In two cases the temporal artery was laid open, and both proved fatal; in fourteen cases leeches were applied, and ten died; eighty-five were copiously bled with lancet, of which 57 died. From these facts it appears that bleeding

generally speaking is so ineffectual a means of preventing a fatal termination of apoplexy, that it scarcely deserves the name of a remedy for the disease. The treatment without the loss of blood was attended with the most favorable results, and the mortality of the disease increased in proportion to the extent to which bleeding was carried,—the more copious the bleeding the more fatal the disease.”

We should not have referred to this practice of bleeding had not the recent uncalled for use of the lancet drawn it out, and for another consideration, that from its power of palliation or immediate relief your school is trying to revive its use, thinking to crush the influence of Homeopathy on the ground that her practitioners have no means to procure such immediate relief in acute diseases. We can do better. We have before us 103 cases of apoplexy reported from various sources, Homeopathically treated, with but 26 deaths.

Diseases following the use of the lancet are said by Dr. Darwin to be rheumatism and gout; Dr. John Hunter says lockjaw and dropsy; Dr. Travers blindness and palsy; Dr. Hall says mania; Dr. Blundell says dysentery; Dr. Broussain says fever and convulsions; Dr. Twitchell says “death universally — slaughter, without mercy or consideration”; Dr. Majendie says that pneumonia, and the entire train of what people call inflammatory pneumonia follows the use of the lancet. He also adds: “It is an extraordinary fact that it will be produced by the same agent that is daily used in combatting it.” To Homeopathy the world is indebted for first raising the warning voice against this sweeping agent of death and revealing a better way. True, before the days of Hahnemann some of the Allopathic writers had serious doubts of its utility, but to our honored leader and his great therapeutic law must the credit be given.

And we can assure you we shall look well after the interests of the community in which we live on this point, as well as all others where the rights of the Homeopathist are invaded, and the lives of the people are in jeopardy.

The direful effects following the lancet in cases of .

### HEMORRHAGE

Are still more apparent. But to illustrate this we should be under the necessity of showing the pathological condition of the system and blood preceding hemorrhage. This our space will not allow. We will only ask you one or two questions, and by the time you have given the public a satisfactory answer to them you will see that to open one vein and waste the life principle to close another, is bad practice.

Is it the healthy patient that is liable to hemorrhage, or is it the weakly, reduced, wasting away, impoverished, consumptive patient? Certainly it is not the former. If, then, hemorrhage follows a weak and impoverished condition of the system, (marasmopyra) is it reasonable to reduce it still more? Is there any too much blood? Are the vital energies so active in the patient lingering on the verge of the grave that the poor sufferer must be further prostrated by the use of the lancet? In every case of bleeding do not the arteries become relaxed by being deprived of their natural nutrition, and does not this relaxed and weakened condition favor hepatisation? We leave you to answer these questions to the satisfaction of the public if you can. If you cannot, be advised, for humanity's sake, in future to forsake the lancet. Sheath its bloody edge, lest God require at your hands the lives of your vene-sected patient. (For particulars on this subject the reader is referred to Dr. Hall, on bleeding.)

Doubtless, my dear Doctor, we have already wearied your patience by the length of our communication. We would

gladly dismiss you with our blessing, but for the public good. Before we do so we must devote a few pages to answering the

### OBJECTIONS TO HOMEOPATHY

So often raised by members of your school. In doing this we promise brevity, as they have been more or less anticipated through our remarks.

The first objection raised is that Homeopathsists

### CURE BY THE IMAGINATION.

We do not deny but that the mind has a vast influence over the physical organization in both producing and curing disease. If this is your position you destroy the efficacy of your own law, for that part of science which teaches us that the body is influenced by the mind, teaches us also that in proportion to the disease and weakness of the body will be the enfeebled and impaired condition of the mind; and as the mind is the spirit or life principle of the body, which imparts power, motion, energy and vitality to the body, therefore, just in proportion as you weaken and impoverish the system by the use of medicines or appliances upon the Allopathic law, in the same ratio you lessen the probability of your patient's recovery. Therefore upon this very argument you base a principle, which, if followed through, would annihilate the law of *contra sufferings* to cure disease, a principle upon which Allopathy depends. Again, suppose that your assertions are true, and that we do cure by the force of imagination, how will you account for the influence of our remedies upon infants, who have not the power of mind fully developed, and as far as their intellect is considered we may as well drop our remedies upon inert matter. But we have shown from our practice that vastly more infants are saved under Homeopathic practice than under Allopathic. You, knowing this to be so, have adopted the Homeopathic prac-



tice as far as you know, in the most fearful of all diseases, scarlet fever. If you expect to work through the imagination only, why use aconite and belladonna? Why not use unmedicated pellets, or alcohol in water?

Again. If you refer to our table of statistics, pages 233 to 250, you will find that in all the most fearful diseases to which flesh is heir, we cure nearly 25 per cent. more than do members of your own school. If, then, the force of imagination is so much superior to Allopathic practice, would you not be doing the community a kindness to adopt it? Would you not save an untold amount of suffering? And would you not save a large number of precious lives? For further proofs we refer you to our proposition on 46th and 47th pages, and also to closing remarks.

Again. In many parts of Europe and the United States it is being rapidly introduced by veterinary surgeons with unparalleled success. And we know of one of these surgeons who is clearing over \$3,000 per annum, using only Homeopathic remedies where medicines are required. Now, how much power of imagination can a horse or cow have over a few little remedies used in this humane manner? Cow and horse faith are things unknown to us—they may be included by Dr. Hooker in his “diversified views.” But the power of our remedies are too well attested by these veterinary surgeons to be questioned. When we were living in Coldwater, Mich., a gentleman came in and gave us an order for 4 oz. of *Hepar sulphuris coleareum* and *mercurius, corrosivus* 200, X attenuation. The quantity attracted our attention, and we asked for what purpose he wanted so much; said he, “I am a veterinary surgeon, and want it to cure poll evil.”

“Will it do it?”

“If the neck bone is left, it will cure as sure as fate.”

Whether this is so or not, we are not prepared to say. The gentleman's confidence in the use of these remedies was unshaken, for said he, "I have cured over a dozen in five years." One thing is certain, the remedies were very appropriately chosen, according to the Homeopathic principle of treating ulcers. For the horses' faith, or the statements of the man, we will not vouch. If they are true, here is a startling rebuke to those who torture these noble animals with Allopathic practice. One thing is certain: If the perusal of this letter should induce poll-evil in our distinguished competitor, and he should apply to us for assistance we would give him the remedies above recommended, regardless of faith or imagination.

Again. Establish the principle you claim, (that we cure by the power of faith, or imagination,) and you establish a principle that will urge people into this practice. For if imagination or faith is capable of producing the results shown in our practice the world over, who, in God's name, would not rather be cured in that way than to have disease blown out through the posterior extremity by purgatives, or through the veins by lancet, drawn from the skin with blisters, or the stomach by emetics?

Finally,—it is just as easy for you to work upon the imagination of your patients, as it is for the Homeopathist. Now, we challenge you to treat parallel cases, you without remedies, with sugar pellets, bread pills, water, and *sachram lactus*, and we will use Homeopathic remedies. We wish to put your argument to the test, as well as to see if you are honest in what you say.

Another knock-down argument of yours is that

#### HOMEOPATHIC SURGEONS

were excluded from serving in the army in the late "un-

pleasantness" between the North and South. Every Homeopathist had all he could do at home. His labors were loudly called for. But hundreds of Allopathists "lying around loose" were glad of the opportunity presented to take \$1200 a year, stealings in, and earn for themselves and families a little "bread and butter." They went; and Surgeon Hammond is reported to have said, "their use of mercury and quinine killed more Northern men than Southern bullets." So much for their practice.

But you are laboring under a mistake. We have before us the names of 50 Homeopathists who were surgeons in the army. Lest you say 'tis not so, we subjoin their names, residences, and addresses:

- Pease, G. M., M. D., Boston. Mass.
- Keys, A. E., M. D., Ravenna, Ohio.
- Keys, B. G., M. D., Ravenna Ohio. Dead.
- Willis, L. M., M. D, Boston, Mass.
- Liebold, C. T. New York city.
- Hill, C. Judson, M. D., Utica, N. Y.
- Lord, F. A., M. D., Chicago, Illinois.
- Halstead, M. H. Leavenworth, Kansas.
- Thayer, S. B., M. D., Battle Creek, Michigan.
- Bumstead, S. J., Pekin, Ill.
- Wheeler, J. P. M. D., Elizabethtown, New Jersey.
- Younglove J., M. D., Brighton, New York.
- Dearborn, A. P. M. D., Brattleboro, Vermont.
- Moore, J. C., M. D., Andover, New Hampshire.
- Colby, E. P., M. D., Boston, Mass.
- Owens, William, M. D., Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Jones, Samuel A., M. D. Englewood, New Jersey.
- Franklin, E. C. M. D., St. Louis.
- Remondino, P. C., Wabashaw, Minn.

Beebe, G. D., M. D., Chicago, Ill.

Foster, W. D. M. D., Hannibal, Mississippi.

Shattuck, H. P., M. D., Boston, Mass.

Allen, J. W., M. D., Altoona, Penn.

Cloud, J. A., M. D., Bordentown, N. J.

Jones, J. B., M. D., Rockford, Ill.

Barlow, George H. M. D.,

Hartshorn, D. W., M. D., Cincinnati, O.

Foster, G. S., M. D., Alleghany City, Pa.

Merrill Ezekiel, M. D., Salem, Mass.

Wade, Jones L., M. D., Salem, Mass.

Webb, Cook E., M. D., Oregon, N. J.

McNeil, D. M. D., Hudson City, N. J.

Petherbridge, D. M. D., Hudson City, N. J.

Rockworth, F. A., M. D., Newark, N. J.

Madeville, F. B., Newark, N. J.

Drs. Richards, Lock, Haven, Price, Powers, R. Weistling,  
C. Van Tagen, W. Ure, John Pease, H. B. Morrell, W. M.  
Babbitt, C. S. P. Pfeiffer, E. B. Holmes, J. P. Wheeler, R.  
W. Martin, and Downing.

Many of these held the first rank as Surgeons in the army, and some the highest commissions. For particulars you are referred to the *U. S. Medical and Surgical Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 18, January number, 1870. Without doubt there are many others whose names have not found their way into that journal.

We can assure you that in the French army Homeopathic surgeons have every position of honor conferred upon them. Considering the demand there was for Homeopathic practitioners at home, and the ungentlemanly course pursued by the Allopathist to keep them out of the service, and that the country was overrun with Allopathists who

could not maintain a practice, we think Homeopathy was pretty well represented.

Your next sweeper against Homeopathy is that there are no

### PERSONS OF DISTINCTION

To be found among her practitioners. Let us hear what your ideas are of men of distinction. If your ideas are that as soon as a man throws aside the rubbish that is loading him down in Allopathic ranks, and embraces Homeopathic principles, he loses his worth and merit as a man, his position in society and his power to reason on a scientific subject, then of course men of distinction are not included in the Homeopathic profession. In Europe at the present time there are over sixty professors of Universities, colleges and seminaries of learning that are warm supporters of her doctrine. Several distinguished professors of European medical colleges have renounced the dogmas of Allopathy, and are now using their pens in defence of Homeopathy. A host of distinguished writers are numbered in her ranks, among whom may be mentioned Professors Henderson, Josslyn, Tessier, Croserio, Roth, Test, Dudgeon, Drysdale, Laurie, Russell, Currie, Rose, Grosenstopff, Dyce Brown, Fleischmann, Rapau, Molin, Madden, Scott, Quinn, Simon, Black, Bayard, Gray, Metcalf, Cox, Ketchun, Jahr, Horner, and a host of others. Are these men unworthy of distinction in the estimation of Dr. J. B. HEMINWAY, of Delavan, Wis., or will you call them knaves and fools, quacks, and dreamers of medicine. Really, doctor, if this is the estimate in which you hold such men, we would like to know the standard of your intellect by which you measure scientific attainments.

In this country we number by the hundred the brightest intellects to give worth and dignity to our school, that ever adorned the medical profession. Nine-tenths of all the cler-



gymen, Catholics excepted, are Homeopaths; three-fourths of all the professors of colleges, seminaries and high schools are supporters of our system, and when you come into our cities and in the higher walks of life, our profession sweeps them mainly by the board.

Now, doctor, don't you feel sad that so many men of real worth and merit are the poor, deluded victims of Homeopathy? What a blessing it would be to the community, and to the nation, if the innumerable thousands of ministers, professors of colleges, seminaries and high schools, thousands of doctors that are leaving Allopathic principles and embracing those of Homeopathy, and the innumerable host of first class citizens of this country and Europe, do not possess sound minds, lofty intellects, and Websterian brains like yourself, so that they might not be the dupes of Homeopathy and the "empty bubble of Hahnemann!" Heaven, have mercy? Pity us poor deluded creatures who love to teach those principles which receive the approval of him who said "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

Another assertion often made by your school is that

#### HOMEOPATHY IS FAST RUNNING OUT.

It is only about sixty years since Homeopathy was first presented to the consideration of the medical profession by Hahnemann, and Allopathists with a spirit of persecution and hatred drove him with blood-thirsty revenge from city to city until he at last found an asylum in the city of Paris, where he died with more honor than any other man who ever wielded a pen in defence of the medical profession. No doubt they hoped, as they forced him from place to place, that they would crush out the life and spirit of this great man, or force him to abandon his views. If you will trouble yourself to read Professor Palmer's lecture upon the principles of Home-

opathy, you will find that he triumphantly boasts over this one thing, by referring to the numerous places Hahnemann located in before he reached Paris. But wheresoever he went he left the seeds of those principles which are now being so rapidly disseminated throughout the world. When the iron hand of Allopathic persecution drove him from place to place, the shout went up from the blood-thirsty crew, "this is the end of Homeopathy!" The same echo still resounds from every Allopathist. For it is seldom we find one of any age but will tell you as a reason why Homeopathy is running out, that he "gave the system a fair trial, and found it destitute of merit." If a Homeopathist thinks it advisable to leave one location for another, they raise the cry, "that Homeopathist tried it here, but could not make a living. The people have no confidence in the system." This was said to us repeatedly in relation to Drs. Coman and Harris when we first came to this place. Nevertheless Homeopathy lives, and is doing well, and her warm supporters in Delavan are the first families in the place. But among the Irish, the whiskey toppers, beer drinkers, the filth and trash, she has no friends; her pure principles find no welcome in the midst of such uncleanness; they, with you, are ever loud in the cry that Homeopathy is fast running out.

Here is what Dr. Forbes, Allopathic Physician and Surgeon Royal to the Queen of England, says on this subject and the growing power of Homeopathy. "No doctrine, however ingenious," said he, "not based on positive demonstrable facts, will be regarded other than as a piece of potential speculation, which may indeed amuse the fancy, but can never influence the conduct of scientific men, much less of practical physicians. But Homeopathy comes before us in a much more imposing aspect, and claims our attention on grounds which

cannot be gainsaid. It presents itself as a new art of medicine, as a mode of practice at variance with that long established in the world, and claims the notice of mankind on *irresistible grounds of superior power of curing disease and preserving human life*, and it comes before us now, not in the garb of a supplement unknown and helpless, but as a conqueror, powerful and triumphant. The disciples of Hahnemann are spread over the whole civilized world. There is not a town of any considerable size in Germany, France, England, or America that does not boast of possessing one or more Homeopathic physicians, not a few of whom are men of the highest respectability and learning, many of them in a large practice, and patronized especially by persons of high rank. New books on Homeopathy are issued in abundance from the press, and journals exclusively devoted to its cause are printed and widely circulated in Europe and America. Numerous hospitals and dispensaries for the treatment of the poor, on the new system, have been established, many of which publish reports blazoning its success—not merely in warm praises, but in the hard words, and hard figures of statistical tables.” This, sir, is plain, unmistakable language, full of force and meaning. They are facts, just as they exist, and as such Professor Forbes felt their weight and acknowledges the truth. Does this look much like Homeopathy running out? How many Allopathists are there in the United States that do not feel the force of this same influence. Let us place three or four of the expressions found in this quotation in separate sentences, and then tell us if it looks as though Homeopathy was on its last legs.

First, “It claims our attention on grounds which cannot be gainsaid.” *Like to cure like.*

Second, “It claims the notice of mankind on irresistible

grounds of superior power of curing disease and saving human life." See statistics.

Third, "It is conquering, powerful, triumphant."

Fourth, "Patronized especially by persons of high rank."

In the United States we have over 5,000 Homeopathic practitioners, a large per cent. are dissenters from Allopathy. We have six prosperous colleges, with a corps of professors whose talent will rank with the same number of men found in any Allopathic college in the United States. We have four quarterly and eight monthly periodicals, and all over the union we have the editorial chair graced by the warm advocates of our school. The editor of the New York *Evening Post*, the *Tribune*, the *Sun*, in fact nearly all the first men in church and state, are ardent advocates of Homeopathy, among whom may be mentioned three of the members of Lincoln's cabinet. Wm. C. Bryant is one of the most devoted advocates of our school, and also Park Goodwin, Chas. A. Dana, Horace Greeley, and John A. Bigelow, late Ambassador to France. In the city of New York we have 300 first class practitioners; in Chicago about 60; in Paris, 100; Vienna, 70; over 150 in London; 6 hospitals, at which have been received 50,138 patients. Russia, Prussia, Austria, and the Confederate States of North Germany have each several hundred practitioners. In nearly every university in the United States the professors more or less employ Homeopaths. Very recently the Parliament of the British Provinces have placed Homeopaths on an equal footing with Allopathists, although the latter fought it long and hard, but too many of the honorable gentlemen had seen its beneficial results to yield to this bull dog principle in Allopathy of choking down the progressive spirit in the science of medicine, and the counter petitions had no more effect upon the reform



views of those members of parliament than your counter-irritants did upon the inflammation in the lungs of our esteemed citizen who departed life February 15, and, as we are told, peeled with blisters, and slaughtered with—good heaven knows, we do not.

This looks as if Homeopathy was played out! Thirty years ago Dr. Graham, a solitary individual first raised the standard of Homeopathy in the city of New York. Now we have over 2,000,000 of warm supporters. You may gain a little comfort, a few dollars from crippled Irish and lager beer gentry, by telling this naughty tale, but it is like Professor Simpson's figuring, a *whopper*!

Again. You say that Homeopaths when they have very sick patients, use

#### ALLOPATHIC THUNDER,

Whereas the very reverse of this is true, as we have on a former occasion shown. The greatest efforts of the regulars is to make the people believe that Homeopathy means an infinitesimal dose instead of a principle, and nothing worries you more than to see us vary the size of the dose according to the requirements of the case. Therefore, when a Homeopathist uses the alkaloids, crude drugs, or mother tinctures, which he seldom does, you cry "he is an Allopathist, for he uses Allopathic doses." There never was nor never can be an Allopathic dose given on Homeopathic principles, for the moment a Homeopathist gives a remedy on any other curative law than that of similitude, that moment he forfeits all claims to Homeopathy, and becomes an Allopathist. There are, however, a great many agents used by both schools which cannot be claimed according to the strict tenets of the formulas of contrariis or similitude, and when this is done you claim we infringe upon the teachings of the regulars. Let us see



if this be true. If an Allopathic physician should happen to have been born in a stable, it would not make him a donkey, neither would it lengthen or shorten his ears. On the other hand, if a Homeopathist thought it necessary for the good of his patient to give deep doses of the mother tincture or the crude drug on the Homeopathic law, he is no nearer an Allopathist than an Allopathist approximates to a jackass by being born in a stable.

### THE AUXILIARY AGENTS

In use by all schools cannot be claimed by your fraternity or ours according to the laws of either. Yet in your uncharitable feeling towards us, you impute all our cures to these agents. When we shall use them upon the principles established by Galen, then, and not till then, upbraid us for infidelity to our principles. Is not the use of light, air, water, food, exercise, cold or hot baths, or the various influences brought to bear upon the mental as well as the physical organizations, useful in the various conditions of disease as remedial agents? There are also steam, sulphuric and other medicated baths, electricity, galvanism, mesmerism, sheet packs, and other agents in the vast researches of hydropathy, all useful in their appropriate places as healing agents, and can you claim one of them upon the Allopathic law of cure? On the other hand, are not many of these agents used strictly on the Homeopathic principle? Would it be honorable in you to deny a suffering patient the use of these agents because you cannot use them on the law of contra-irritants? Why, then, may we not use them for the good of ours? But many of these agents are, in the strictest adaptation of the term, Homeopathic to the disease, and if intelligently used corroborate the principles inculcated by our school, e. g., cloths wrung from hot water and applied to the surface of

the body in cases of inflammation. Electricity, electro-magnetism, when used as a therapeutic agent, can only be applied on the Homeopathic principle that "like will cure like." It will produce and cure inflammation, paralysis, tetanus, anoxemie, neuralgia, rheumatism, headache, etc. Is not this truly Homeopathic principle carried into practice in the hands of the regulars? Why don't you call Drs. Althrost, Gurnsey, Bowls, Clark, and other allopathists to your court, and exterminate them for publishing elaborate works recommending this agent to the public for its many healing virtues. We also think the use of vaporific, sulphuric, alcoholic, and electro-thermal baths, as well as galvanism, mesmerism, or animal magnetism, approximate fully as near to our law of cure as they do to the allopathic, and are much more merciful in their application than emetics, blisters, etc., and infinitely more useful in the healing art.

Again, the homeopathist has equal rights with you in the use of

#### MECHANICAL AGENTS,

Or even to the use of drugs for certain mechanical purposes. As Dr. Holcomb has remarked, "vomiting may expel a poison from the stomach, a gall-stone from the biliary duct, or a false membrane from the wind pipe. The homeopathist may thus use emetics for mechanical purposes," and violate no law of the reform school. We can use ergot to empty the uterus, belladonna to dilate the pupil, chloroform to relax the muscles, sulphur ointment to kill the itch insect, vermifuge to destroy or expel worms, (can do better than that) and in certain cases astringents, diluents, emollients and protectives, such as collodion, are examples of drugs being used to bring about certain mechanical ends which are all admissible in the strictest homeopathic practices.

Purgatives, in some cases of great intestinal obstruction or torpor, become simply mechanical agents, and can be used without any violation of the principles of homeopathy. Even blood-letting as a mechanical measure is perfectly allowable in the reform school, therefore the homeopathist does not throw his lancet away, he simply "lets it rest," because the superiority of his system enables him to cure his patient without its use.

We are not violating any principle of homeopathy, or infringing upon any law of allopathy, if we avail ourself of the use of any

#### CHEMICAL AGENTS

Which act in accordance with the laws of organic or inorganic chemistry, as the case may require. The antidotes of many poisons are used on this principle, and of course in the sized dose found requisite by laboratory experiments, a certain quantity of antidote being required to neutralize a certain quantity of poison. In these cases we are laboring to eradicate or antidote a poison which will, if continued in the system, produce a medicinal disease, or perhaps death. Here we are not curing disease, but preventing it, and death. This is not on the law of allopathy any more than that of homeopathy. It is not according to your formula of *Contra, Contrariis, Curantur*, or our law of *Similia, Similibus, Curantur*, but according to the laws of chemistry, and approved of by all practitioners.

But if the dose of poison had not been sufficient to have destroyed life, as is the case with the major part of your prescriptions, and the poison had produced chronic medicinal disease, as for example those enumerated on page 73 resulting from the abusive use of mercury, we would have followed the same course we daily do, by relieving the sufferings of

your crippled, empirically poisoned crew by the use of minute doses of such homeopathic remedies, electro-magnetism, baths, etc., as we felt confident would cure.

Again, homeopathy has equal claims upon anatomy, physiology, botany, surgery and obstetrics with the allopathists, but like all her other great reforms she is simplifying and rendering more humane and beneficial all departments pertaining to the science of medicine. Yet, to hear you talk, one not acquainted with our school would suppose these branches were all the legitimate and exclusive rights of Old Physic, and that the homeopathist had rejected them all, were introducing a new anatomy of the human system, or some patent-right way of getting a baby.

Such silly trash is what you are constantly pressing upon the people, and such the argument we are daily forced to meet. We leave it for the reader to judge which of the two is the greatest professional thief, you or I, and whether you are not in the daily habit of using our remedies. Dr. Holcomb also remarks on chemical therapeutics, that the homeopathist has equal right to the use of acids and alkalies for excessive alkalinity or acidity in the gastro-intestinal, or urinary secretions; vegetable acids for scurvy, alkalies to dissolve inspissated mucous in some bronchial affections, certain remedies that modify the chemical condition of the blood; phosphate of lime when deficient in the bones; chlorine, charcoal, creosote and other antiseptics to avert or prevent putridity. This is neither according to the laws of homeopathy or allopathy, but vital chemistry, operating by special laws of its own and are free to the advocates of any system of medicine. Even the hydropathist could use these with impunity.

Again you say all there is of

## HOMOEOPATHY IS SMALL DOSES.

This is the Allopathic version. This has been answered. See page 92. Compare these with those of Allopathy from page 51 to 92.

We will, however, again remark, that *Homeopathy is not a dose, but a principle*, having for its foundation fixed and established laws, unerring in its effects, which enables the physician to know what he is doing and to do what he knows will cure his patient. We have yet to learn that the practice of either school means dose. Should an Allopathist give one drop or forty, if he gave it to produce the primary action of the remedy, he would prescribe according to his theory. And if a Homeopathist should give five drops or the 30th attenuation of any remedy in order to gain the secondary effect of the medicine and cure symptoms of its like, he would still be a Homeopathist and nothing else. But we pity the patient who must submit to Homeopathic doses on a large scale.

Again you say,

## SMALL DOSES CANNOT PRODUCE CURES IN ACUTE DISEASES.

Please turn to the table of Statistics and compare the results of the two systems, and before God and high heaven keep silent. Should that not satisfy you we refer you to our proposition on page 46, and concluding remarks.

Again you say,

## THESE INFINITESIMAL DOSES CANNOT IMPRESS THE SYSTEM.

See the power of imponderable agents, pages 137, 138, 141, 142, and 143.

One of the great errors of your school is the supposition that the impression made by your remedies is the curative power of the medicine; and that this "cleaning out process,"



“throwing up Jonah,” “blowing the patient out straight,” “cleansing the blood,” so often held out as a necessary action of remedies, is a nice delusion, strongly impressed upon the minds of those individuals who refuse to investigate facts as they are, or who allow allopathists to think for them. If “stirring up the liver,” “throwing off the bile,” “purifying the blood,” and “cleansing the stomach” were really the facts following the use of cathartics and emetics, you would have some plea for their use. But do you suppose these purgatives run to and fro through every part of the system to pick up the particles of deleterious matter, plunge into the liver to “stir it up,” catch up the vitiated particles of impure blood and leave the pure? Do you believe these gross, ponderable, poisonous agents are endowed with power which enables them to tell the pure from the impure particles of the blood? Can you define the law which enables them to gather the vitiated humors which make a man ill, and then dispatch them on “double-quick,” out at the posterior extremity? If not, the impression you seek is empirical, and the result injurious. We know why the sea monster vomited forth the prophet of God, but can see no reason why poisonous masses of drugs should be taken into the system to expel an agent so minute that no chemist can analyze or detect its elements. The day is not far distant when it will be easier for you to make an intelligent man believe that Jonah swallowed the whale, than that emetics and cathartics are useful in eradicating disease from the system, or that they cleanse the blood, or purify the stomach. True, an emetic will, by the peristaltic action of the stomach, empty the gall-bladder of its contents, an amount equal to one or two ounces. What a victory! What a heroic deed! What laurels won by Allopathists! Angels stand amazed, the heavens bow, and pollywogs wiggle their

tails, in consequence of this great achievement! But, Doctor, the gall-bladder is filled from three to four times every 24 hours. Will you keep up an eternal puke or an everlasting purge for the purpose of keeping the gall-bladder empty? Truly, there is sufficient cause for "man's going to his long home, and the mourners going around the streets," for the Allopathist, has been impressing the system,—alas! in too many cases it is a final impression!

Well do we remember seeing these regular functionaries administering emetics, holding the heads of their patients, pouring down quarts of warm water, and every time the poor victimized wretch would he-o-heave, or with a dying groan give forth a muffled New York, followed by convulsions and straining, belch forth a mouthful of bile, then the doctor with surprise exclaims, "Good God! what a foul stomach! No wonder you are sick!" conveying the impression that this gall was in the stomach prior to the action of the emetic, and that it produced the difficulties of which the patient was complaining. Oh, what trash this puking fraternity crams upon the people! How wilfully blind are they to believe a "lie, that they may be damned!"

If this is the impression you say the Homeopathist cannot get from his remedies, we acknowledge defeat. Thank heaven, this is just what we avoid. We know this practice of "clearing out the system" and "purifying the blood," so far from having that effect, acts just the reverse. These medicines are taken up and carried into the blood, making it impure, loading it with poisonous particles, and ultimately engendering disease. This is the impression we studiously avoid. We impress, not the system, but the organ diseased. In this way we act by the specific power of our remedies upon the disease itself, thereby exterminating it without killing

the patient. The Allopathic way of impressing is to "weaken the patient to weaken the disease," "reduce the patient to reduce the fever," in short, in too many instances they kill the patient to kill the disease. A bear said to Col. Crockett one day, "I am impressed with the idea that you are going to shoot." "Wall," said the Col., "you am impressed about rite." "Whang" went the rifle and down came the bear. So when we see you Allopathists impressing the system it reminds us that the "impressed" patients are likely to share the fate of Crockett's bear.

We think we have presented the two theories of practice in such a light that the most simple reader cannot fail to distinguish the superiority of our system over Allopathy. We will therefore dismiss you with a few brief

#### REFLECTIONS.

You may ask why we have chosen to address our remarks to you, instead of other members of the Allopathic profession.

We assure you, doctor, that it is not from any personal ill feelings. We have none towards you or any other Allopathist in this place; for with the principles of justice and eternal truth on our side, we doubt not but that we shall be enabled to protect ourselves against all the power of empiric practice, or unanswerable arguments. If, however, such arguments can be presented against the Homeopathic system, give them to us and the public for general good. If you will turn to the 18th page you will see some of the reasons presented for addressing you, and as you claim to be the first in professional attainments, it would have been a mark of cowardice in us to have done other than we have. Judging from your practice you doubtless have honorably earned the position you occupy. You, however, have led the van in presenting false statements about the Homeopathic system, therefore we were

determined to place you in a position in which you would be forced to defend what you have said about Homeopathy, or be held up as a man given to misrepresenting facts. And, finally, your pretense of offering the people Homeopathic practice, when you know as little about it as the Pope does of true religion, compelled us for the good of our system to adopt this course and show the people that you were acting the part of a deceiver. Consequently we have placed you in the position Crockett did the coon, viz., to make an unconditional surrender or take the consequences which would likely follow. All the Col. wanted was the coon's hide. Not so with us; we differ materially from the brave coon exterminator. We want neither hide nor tallow from Allopathist, but what we do want is that they represent the principles of the reform school honestly and fairly. If you pretend to give Homeopathic practice, give it as it is. Get Hempel's *Materia Medica*, with some other standard work, carefully study the principles and act according to their teachings, and we shall have no occasion to refer you to Exodus xx, 13th verse.

In relation to the fifth class of Allopathists, we here remark, if there are none introducing a system not sanctioned or taught by the authorities of the profession for the treatment of female diseases, then none can be offended at the remarks on the 15th, 22d and 23d pages. But if this treatment is such that no respectable practitioner of any school will sanction its usage; if it is immoral in its tendency, perverting the purity, modesty and chastity of woman; if it is degrading to the dignity of true politeness and gentlemanly decorum; if the practitioner passes the bounds of professional teachings, of purity, modesty and respectability; if it places the patients in a position revolting to their feelings and the dictates of an honest heart; if it is a crime against the mar-

riage ritual, the rights of the husband, the moral rights of society, the laws of the land, and high heaven, it is time the people knew it. Such only will be offended who worship at this shrine, and extol the practice.

### IN CONCLUSION

We must say, we would much rather have entered into a controversy without language destined to injure the feelings of any, without criticism or sarcasm, without appealing to the prejudices or passions of the public.

We have, however, only followed the example set by those who have hurled their odious epithets upon us. We would that this were otherwise, and that in the battle for right a respectful and honorable spirit might ever mark the character of rival disputants.

We have looked for and expect opposition in the practice of Homeopathy. We expect to have many a hard fought battle before our work is done, before the people are freed from prejudice, which your misrepresentations fan into a flame. But the time has come when the sword of persecution by Allopathists should be sheathed, and investigation take its place.

When Allopathists will take this course, and act the part of professional gentlemen, rest assured that Homeopaths will follow.

And finally, that this course may be brought about, and that there may be no more talk on your part, or that of your friends, about our qualifications or the respective treatments of the two systems, we make you the following

### PROPOSITION:

We will allow any Allopathist of Delavan to visit our patients with us, and submit our practice to their criticism, provided they will allow us to visit theirs, granting us the same



privilege. We will each explain in writing our views of the case, the nature of the disease, the remedies to be given, the size of the dose, what given for, and what effect we designed to produce with the remedy. We will then, through the columns of the *Delavan Republican*, criticise each other's practice. We will pay for your communication, and you for ours. Submit to this proposition or the one on page 46, or in behalf of suffering humanity and high heaven, keep silent.

*Respectfully submitted, by*

R. STODDARD GEE.

# INDEX.

---

- A DELAVAN Allopathist screwed tight, 177 to 181.
- ALLOPATHIC Persecution, 25 to Practice for Quinsey, 32. [30.
- “ “ Jaundice, 33.
- “ “ Hemorrhage, 34.
- “ “ Pneumonia, 35.
- “ “ Pleuritis, 35 and 191.
- “ “ Laryngitis, 35.
- “ “ Suffocative Bronchitis, 35.
- “ “ Glossitis, 37.
- “ “ Headache, illustrated, 52 to 61.
- “ “ Mania, 61 & 192.
- “ “ Scarlet Fever, 215
- “ “ a failure in Scarlet Fever, 212.
- “ “ Consumption, 66.
- “ “ Delirium Tremens 68.
- “ “ Cholera, 243 to 248.
- “ “ Fever, 62 and 63.
- Garbling, 31.
- Admission, (Dr. Hudson,) 35.
- Remedies, 33 to 38, and 69.
- Murders imputed to God, 40.
- Law of Cure, 51.
- Figuring, 116 to 120.
- “ Reviewed, 121.
- Efforts to Deceive, 114.
- ALLOPATHIC Remedies applied to healthy parts, 79.
- Error, 122.
- Testimony in Court, 134.
- Cowardice, 155.
- Cures explained on Homeopathic principles, 166.
- Conspiracy exposed, 152.
- Life Preservers Examined, 84 to 89.
- ALLOPATHIST — Imported, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24.
- ALLOPATHISTS like Butchers, 36.
- Like the Gardener, 90.
- Driven to Falsifying, 127.
- Refuse to counsel with Homeopaths, 139.
- Misrepresent Homeopathy, 131
- Fear the devil will mistake them for swine, 193.
- Admit three facts, 80.
- Going into other business more respectable, 76.
- Like a man shooting at a squirrel, 91.
- Like lawyer Baccus, 130.
- Views of their own system, 197 to 207.
- Know they are falsifying, 125.
- Beginning Practice, 190.
- Turning Homeopaths, 44 & Disagree, 64 to 65. [290.
- ALLOPATHY like Catholicism, 37.

- ALLOPATHY illustrated by A, B, C, & D, 54, 61, 78, 81 to 86, and 187.  
 Includes everything, 188 to 190  
 Ancient and Modern Compared, 39.  
 Defined by Hooker, 188.  
 Prosperous in the low walks of life, 87.  
 Reduces the system, 79.  
 Effects of in a few words, 72.  
 A hydra-headed monster, 70 and 108.  
 In danger, 24 and 26.  
 A system of guesswork, 52.  
 Compounding remedies, 91.  
 Has no principles about practicing, 133, 136, and 194.  
 In Canada, 134.  
 Teaches ten principles, 187.  
 Unjust in his claims on discoveries, 28.  
 Issues Bull, like the Pope, 131.  
 Expels a monster, 108.  
 American and German ladies differently examined, 193.  
 Belladonna in scarlet fever, 212 and 218.  
 BLEEDING Condemned, 269.  
 In Inflammation, 271 to 277.  
 In Apoplexy, 278 to 280.  
 Produces disease, 279.  
 Chemical Action of Remedies, 112 and 294.  
 Curative Power of Drugs, 105.  
 Death from Bleeding, 274 to 279.  
 Different theories, 16.  
 Diversity of Allopathy admitted, 194.  
 Druggist held accountable, 173.  
 Dynamic power of Drugs, 156 to 162.  
 Dynamic action of Remedies, 113, 156 to 162.  
 Disease an imponderable agent, 108.  
 Dr. D's practice compared, 72.  
 Dr. D's practice sustained by Allopathic law, 57.  
 Dr. Forbes' views of Allopathy, 197.  
 Dr. Forbes' confession, 167, 168.  
 Dr. Gardner's confession, 207.  
 Dr. Gardner's testimony, 212.  
 Dr. Galen's law, 77.  
 Dialogue on Homeopathy, 196.  
 Dr. Widkins, 198.  
 Dr. Paine, 198.  
 Dr. Zimmermann, 199.  
 Dr. Hufiland, 200.  
 Eight general principles of Homeopathy, 183.  
 England's Christianity like Allopathy, 170.  
 Effects of quinine, 171.  
 Electricians' views of disease, 108.  
 Five reasons why Allopathy is wrong, 195.  
 Facts about our doses, 124.  
 Fate of Homeopathy sealed, 124.  
 Fable of the ox and toad, 116.  
 Fable of the boys and frogs, 88.  
 Five classes of Allopathists, 15.  
 HEMINWAY, J. B., M. D.—  
 Inconsistent position, 40 & 49.  
 Stealing Homeopathic Remedies, 50.  
 On Surgery, 47 and 199.  
 Choose between ancient and modern Allopathy, 74.  
 Deceives the people by misrepresenting Homeopathic principles, 128.  
 Believes a falsehood, or he don't, 129 and 130.  
 And the devil offer what they haven't got, 147.

HEMINWAY, J. B., M. D.—  
 On Homeopathic practice, 148.  
 As judge, 75.  
 Must come to terms or back down, 46.  
 Practice illustrated, 169, 170.  
 Must defend one of three propositions, 220.  
 Must choose one of three, 186.  
 Practice like Col. Crockett, 200.  
 Practice like Dr. Gatling, 199.  
 Practice vs. Dr. Gee's, 213.  
 Don't give Allopathic practice in scarlet fever, 215, 216, 217.  
 Choose between three propositions, 220.  
 Prescription examined, 248.  
 To answer questions, 41.  
 Haunted by ghosts, 249.  
 Had better act honorable, 131.  
 Fears poll evil, 283.  
 Hard words poor arguments, 256.  
 HOMEOPATHY not inferior to Allopathy, 20.  
 Protects the strength of her patient, 84 to 87.  
 Willing to be tested, 46.  
 Different from Allopathy, 189.  
 In Canada, 134.  
 Not claimed a perfected system, 190.  
 One universal principle not fully developed, 189.  
 And Allopathic falsehoods side by side, 129.  
 Attacks the disease, 103.  
 Life Ins. Companies, 87.  
 Must attenuate its remedies, 103 and 104.  
 Seeks a slight aggravation of symptoms, 102.  
 Specifics, 95.

HOMEOPATHY — Its principles, 92 and 77.  
 vs. Allopathy, 261.  
 Cures by imagination, 281.  
 Its surgeons, 283.  
 Has no persons of distinction, 286.  
 Fast running out, 287.  
 vs. Allopathic thunder, 291.  
 Uses auxiliary agents, 292.  
 “ mechanical agents, 293.  
 “ chemical agents, 294.  
 Cannot impress the system, 296.  
 Hahnemann's views about disease, 109.  
 Hooker, Dr., defines Allopathy, 188 and 189.  
 Hypotheses, 73.  
 How Homeopaths select remedies, 94 to 105.  
 Gain knowledge of remedies, 103 and 104.  
 Prepare remedies, 124 to 128.  
 Use their remedies, 132.  
 Prescribe, 209 and 261.  
 How Allopathists select remedies, 91 and 261.  
 Infinitesimal doses of nature, 217 to 220.  
 Increase in length of life due to Homeopathy, 87.  
 Last year's practice, 47.  
 Last argument, 139.  
 Law and order in God's work, 181 to 183.  
 Law of quantity considered, 209 and 211.  
 Mechanical action of remedies, 111 and 293.  
 Mercurial salivation by accident, 142.  
 MacLaughland, Dr., on cholera, 221.

- Nature of disease, 106.  
 Naming the child, 258.  
 Objections answered, 281.  
 People, great fault of, 253.  
 Palliatives exposed, 263 to 269.  
 Pope's bull like Allopathy, 131.  
 Primary and secondary action of remedies, 105, 164, and 167.  
 Principles of Homeopathy, 77.  
 Proposition, 46.  
 Persecution no argument, 25.  
 Practice of imported royalty, 17.  
 Preparing remedies, 156.  
 Power of small doses, 104, 137 to 144, and 156 to 160.  
 Professor Palmer's calculation, 118, 123.  
 Professor Palmer's garbling, 126.  
 Prof. Palmer in the liquor business, 119.  
 Prof. Palmer collapses, 119.  
 Relation between disease and remedies, 174 to 176.  
 Relative success of the two systems compared, 221.  
 Reasonable claims of Homeopathy, 160.  
 Reasons why "like to like" cures, 98 to 101.  
 Reasons for this letter, 9.  
 Soothing Syrup, Mrs. Winslow's, 172.  
 Specific action of opium, 176.  
 Specific action of foreign substances, 177.  
 Specific action proven from Allopathists, 175.  
 Summing up of facts, 183.  
 Susceptibility of the nervous system to small doses, 143 and 144.  
 Statistics, 223, 228 to 240.  
 Statistics of cholera compared, 231 to 232.  
 Dr. Franklin vs. Allopathy, 233 to 242.  
 Small doses considered, 113.  
 Specific action of remedies, 63, 103, 174 to 177.  
 Statistics of Dr. Fleischmann, 232.  
 Three laws upon which remedies act, 163.  
 Three reasons why Allopathists fail in the use of Homeopathic remedies, 146 to 152.  
 Ten theories of Allopathy, 187.  
 Why Homeopathy is not understood, 253.  
 Why Homeopaths are not employed in some places, 196.  
 Why "like to like" cures, 94.  
 Will small doses cure, 184.  
 Where Homeopaths find proof, 255.





NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 02093938 4